

RATIONAL CURVES ON HYPERSURFACES OF LOW DEGREE, II

JOE HARRIS AND JASON STARR

ABSTRACT. This is a continuation of [7] in which we proved irreducibility of spaces of rational curves on a general hypersurface $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of degree $d < \frac{n+1}{2}$. In this paper, we prove that if $d^2 + d + 2 \leq n$ and if $d \geq 3$, then the spaces of rational curves are themselves rationally connected.

CONTENTS

1. Statement of results	1
2. Deformation ample	3
3. Some deformation theory	8
4. Properties of families of stable maps	16
5. The induction argument	24
6. Twistable lines	31
7. A very positive, very twisting family of lines	36
8. Proof of the main theorem	47
References	47

1. STATEMENT OF RESULTS

In [7], it is proved that if $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a general hypersurface of degree $d < \frac{n+1}{2}$, then each space $\text{RatCurves}^e(X)$ parametrizing smooth rational curves of degree e on X , is itself an integral, local complete intersection scheme of the expected dimension $(n+1-d)e + (n-4)$. More precisely, it is proved that for every stable A -graph τ and every flag $f \in \text{Flag}(\tau)$, the Behrend-Manin stack $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$ is an integral, local complete intersection stack of the expected dimension $\dim(X, \tau)$, and the evaluation morphism $\text{ev}_f : \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow X$ is flat of the expected fiber dimension $\dim(X, \tau) - \dim(X)$. Since $\text{RatCurves}^e(X)$ is a Zariski open set in the stack $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$, the result on $\text{RatCurves}^e(X)$ follows.

After establishing irreducibility and the dimension of the spaces $\text{RatCurves}^e(X)$, the next question is to determine the Kodaira dimension of $\text{RatCurves}^e(X)$. For a general Fano hypersurface $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ with $d \leq n$, determining the Kodaira dimensions of $\text{RatCurves}^e(X)$ is subtle. For instance for smooth cubic threefolds $X_3 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, X has a nontrivial intermediate Jacobian $J(X)$, and the Abel-Jacobi maps $\text{RatCurves}^e(X) \rightarrow J(X)$ is dominant for $e \geq 4$. So the Kodaira dimension is

Date: February 1, 2008.

at least 0; conjecturally the fibers of the Abel-Jacobi map are rationally connected so that the Kodaira dimension is exactly 0.

On the other hand for $d = 1, 2$, it is a theorem of Kim and Pandharipande [9, theorem 3], that each of the spaces $\text{RatCurves}^e(X)$ is itself a rational variety, and thus has Kodaira dimension $-\infty$. In this paper we present the following generalization of [9, theorem 3]:

Theorem 1.1. *Given positive integers (d, n) with $d^2 + d + 2 \leq n$ and $d \geq 3$, for $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ a general hypersurface of degree d , each of the spaces $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is rationally connected. Thus $\text{RatCurves}^e(X)$ has a rationally connected compactification.*

To remind the reader, a variety V is rationally connected if given two general points $p, q \in V$, there is a map $f : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow V$ whose image contains p and q . This property is strictly weaker than rationality, and it is unknown whether this property is the same as unirationality. It is a priori a much simpler property to check. And any rationally connected variety has Kodaira dimension $-\infty$, therefore each of the schemes $\text{RatCurves}^e(X)$ has Kodaira dimension $-\infty$.

The proofs rely on [10, theorem IV.3.7]: given a smooth variety V and a morphism $f : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow V$ such that f^*T_V is an ample vector bundle, then V is rationally connected. This criterion also works for smooth Deligne-Mumford stacks V . For readers not versed in stacks, this is a moot point – every morphism of $\mathbb{P}^1$ into a stack constructed in this paper can be deformed to a map contained in the fine moduli locus of the stack. For a Behrend-Manin stack, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$, a morphism $f : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$ is equivalent to a fibered surface $\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$, with some collection of sections $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \Sigma$, and a map $f : \Sigma \rightarrow X$. Assuming that $f : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$ maps into the *unobstructed locus*, the bundle $f^*T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)}$ can be computed from a universal construction applied to the datum $(\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r, f)$. Thus, to prove $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$ is rationally connected, we are reduced to finding a datum $(\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r, \mathbb{P}^1)$ satisfying certain properties.

In the proof of the induction step, we will use the following technical hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1.2. For each contraction of genus 0 stable A -graphs, $\phi : \sigma \rightarrow \tau$, the codimension of the image of the corresponding morphism of Behrend-Manin stacks $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$ equals $\dim(X, \tau) - \dim(X, \sigma)$.

In particular, by [7, proposition 7.4], for a general $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ with $d < \frac{n+1}{2}$, each stack $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)$ has the expected dimension, and hypothesis 1.2 holds for X .

Hypothesis 1.3. The general fiber of the evaluation map $\text{ev} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1) \rightarrow X$ is irreducible.

In particular, for a general pair $([X], [p])$ consisting of a hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of degree d and a point $p \in X$, the associated fiber of ev is a subvariety $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ which is a complete intersection of a general sequence of hypersurfaces $Y_1, \dots, Y_d$ in $\mathbb{P}^n$ with $\deg(Y_i) = i$. By the Bertini-Kleiman theorem, a general such complete intersection is smooth and connected if $d < n - 1$.

Hypothesis 1.4. For each integer $e \geq 0$, the locus in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$ parametrizing stable maps with nontrivial automorphism group has codimension at least 2.

Of course any stable map with nontrivial automorphism group has an irreducible component which is a multiple cover of its image. In light of [7, proposition 7.4], a simple parameter count shows that for a general hypersurface $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ with $d \leq \frac{n+1}{2}$, hypothesis 1.4 is satisfied.

1.1. Acknowledgments. We are very grateful to Johan de Jong and Steven Kleiman for many useful conversations.

2. DEFORMATION AMPLE

Unless stated otherwise, all schemes will be finite type, separated schemes over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}$. All absolute fiber products will be fiber products over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}$.

The following lemma is completely trivial.

Lemma 2.1. *Let B be a connected, proper, prestable curve of arithmetic genus 0 and let E be a locally free sheaf on E which is generated by global sections. Then $H^1(B, E)$ is zero. Moreover if $p \in B$ is any point and $\mathcal{I}_p \subset \mathcal{O}_B$ is the corresponding ideal sheaf, then $H^1(B, \mathcal{I}_p \cdot E)$ is zero.*

Proof. Since E is generated by global sections, there is a short exact sequence of the form:

$$0 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_B^{\oplus N} \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow 0 \quad (1)$$

Since B is a curve, $H^2(B, K) = 0$. Therefore we have a surjection $H^1(B, \mathcal{O}_B)^{\oplus N} \rightarrow H^1(B, E)$. Since B is connected of arithmetic genus 0, $H^1(B, \mathcal{O}_B)$ is zero. Hence $H^1(B, E)$ is zero.

Now for any point $p \in B$ we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_p \cdot E \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow E|_p \longrightarrow 0 \quad (2)$$

This gives rise to a long exact sequence in cohomology:

$$H^0(B, E) \longrightarrow E|_p \longrightarrow H^1(B, \mathcal{I}_p \cdot E) \longrightarrow H^1(B, E) \quad (3)$$

By the last paragraph, $H^1(B, E)$ is zero. And since E is generated by global sections, $H^0(B, E) \rightarrow E|_p$ is surjective. Therefore $H^1(B, \mathcal{I}_p \cdot E)$ is zero. $\square$

Suppose given a connected, proper, prestable curve B of arithmetic genus 0 and a locally free sheaf E of positive rank on B . Any pair $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E})$ consisting of a flat family of connected, proper prestable curves over a DVR, say $\pi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ along with a locally free sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ on $\mathcal{B}$ such that the closed fiber of π is isomorphic to B , such that the generic fiber B_η of π is smooth, and such that the restriction of $\mathcal{E}$ to $B \subset \mathcal{B}$ is isomorphic to E will be called a *smoothing* of the pair (B, E) . We want to know when (B, E) satisfies the condition that for every smoothing $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E})$, the restriction $\mathcal{E}_\eta$ of $\mathcal{E}$ to the generic fiber is an ample locally free sheaf. Certainly if E is ample, this is true, but E need not be ample for this condition to hold: e.g. if E is an invertible sheaf such that the total degree of E is positive, then every smoothing of (B, E) will have ample generic fiber. Although it is not the most general criterion, we find the following notion to be useful and it is the one we use in the remainder of the paper.

Definition 2.2. Let B be a connected, proper, prestable curve of arithmetic genus 0. A locally free sheaf E on B with positive rank is *deformation ample* if

1. E is generated by global sections, and
2. $H^1(B, E(K_B))$ is zero, where $\mathcal{O}_B(K_B)$ is the dualizing sheaf of B .

Remark 2.3.

1. Conditions (1) and (2) above are independent.
2. If E is invertible, then E is deformation ample iff the restriction of E to every irreducible component has nonnegative degree and the restriction to at least one irreducible component has positive degree.
3. For a general E , one can determine whether E is deformation ample in terms of the splitting type of the restriction of E to each irreducible component together with the patching isomorphisms at the nodes of B .

Definition 2.4. Let T be a scheme and let $\pi : B \rightarrow T$ be a family of prestable curves of arithmetic genus 0. A locally free sheaf E on B with positive rank is π -relatively deformation ample (or simply deformation ample if π is understood) if

1. the canonical map $\pi^*\pi_*E \rightarrow E$ is surjective, and
2. $R^1\pi_*(E(K_\pi))$ is zero, where $\mathcal{O}_B(K_\pi)$ is the relative dualizing sheaf of π .

Lemma 2.5. *With notation as in definition 2.4, suppose $f : T' \rightarrow T$ is a morphism of schemes and let $\pi' : B' \rightarrow T'$ be the base-change of π by f . Let E' be the pullback of E by the projection $g : B' \rightarrow B$. If E is π -relatively deformation ample, then E' is π' -relatively deformation ample. If f' is surjective, the converse also holds.*

Proof. For the main direction, by [6, section 8.5.2, proposition 8.9.1], it suffices to consider the case when T and T' are Noetherian affine schemes.

There is a canonical map of $\mathcal{O}_{T'}$ -modules $\alpha : f^*\pi_*E \rightarrow (\pi')_*g^*E$. There is a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (\pi')^*f^*\pi_*E & \xrightarrow{=} & g^*\pi^*\pi_*E \\
 (\pi')^*\alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 (\pi')^*(\pi')_*E' & \longrightarrow & E'
 \end{array} \tag{4}$$

Since $\pi^*\pi_*E \rightarrow E$ is surjective, we conclude that $g^*\pi^*\pi_*E \rightarrow E'$ is surjective. Therefore also $(\pi')^*(\pi')_*E' \rightarrow E'$ is surjective.

Now $R^2\pi_*E(K)$ is identically zero. So by [8, theorem III.12.11(b)], we conclude that for every closed point $t \in T$, we have $H^1(B_t, E(K)|_{B_t}) = 0$. By [8, prop. III.9.3], we conclude that for every closed point $t' \in T'$, we have $H^1(B'_{t'}, E'(K')|_{B'_{t'}}) = 0$. So by [8, theorem III.12.11(a)] and Nakayama's lemma, we conclude that $R^1\pi'_*(E'(K'))$ is identically zero. This shows that E' is π' -relatively deformation ample.

For the converse in case $T' \rightarrow T$ is surjective, we may reduce to the case that T is a Noetherian affine scheme. By the argument above, we conclude that for each closed point $t' \in T'$, we have $H^1(B'_{t'}, E'(K')|_{B'_{t'}}) = 0$. Since $T' \rightarrow T$ is surjective, we conclude by [8, prop. III.9.3] that for each closed point $t \in T$ we have $H^1(B_t, E(K)|_{B_t}) = 0$. So by [8, theorem III.12.11(a)] and Nakayama's lemma, we conclude that $R^1\pi_*(E(K))$ is identically zero.

It remains to show that E is π -relatively generated by global sections. For each point $t \in T$, there is some point $t' \in T'$ mapping to t . Since $E'|_{B_{t'}}$ is generated by global sections, it follows that $E|_{B_t}$ is generated by global sections. So, by lemma 2.1, we conclude that $H^1(B_t, E|_{B_t})$ is zero. So by [8, theorem III.12.11(a)] and Nakayama's lemma, we conclude that $R^1\pi_*(E)$ is identically zero. Since E is flat over T , it follows by a standard argument that for any coherent $\mathcal{O}_T$ -module $\mathcal{F}$, we have that $R^1\pi_*(\pi^*\mathcal{F} \otimes E)$ is also zero. In particular, applying the long exact sequence of higher direct images to the short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \pi^*\mathcal{I}_t \otimes E \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow E|_{B_t} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (5)$$

we conclude that $\pi_*(E) \rightarrow H^0(B_t, E|_{B_t})$ is surjective. Since $E|_{B_t}$ is generated by global sections for each $t \in T$, we conclude that E is π -relatively generated by global sections. $\square$

Lemma 2.6. *With notation as in definition 2.4, if π is smooth, then E is π -relatively deformation ample iff E is π -relatively ample.*

Proof. Both properties are local on T and can be checked after étale, surjective base-change of T . Thus we may assume that $\pi : B \rightarrow T$ is isomorphic to $\pi_1 : T \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow T$. Define $F = (\pi_1)_*(E \otimes \pi_2^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1))$. There is a natural map $\alpha : (\pi_1)^*F \otimes \pi_2^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1) \rightarrow E$. Suppose that E is deformation ample. Then the claim is that α is surjective. To prove this, it suffices to prove the following:

1. For each geometric point t of T with residue field κ , we have $H^1(\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1, E|_{B_t} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1))$ is trivial,
2. $\pi^*F|_{B_t} = H^0(\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1, E|_{B_t} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1))$, and
3. the map $H^0(\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1, E|_{B_t} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1) \rightarrow E|_{B_t}$ is surjective.

Now by Grothendieck's lemma [8, exercise V.2.6], $E|_{B_t}$ splits as a direct sum $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(a_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(a_r)$ for some integers $a_1 \leq \cdots \leq a_r$. By lemma 2.5, we know that $E|_{B_t}$ is deformation ample. It follows that $a_1 \geq 1$. Thus $H^1(B_t, E|_{B_t} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)) = 0$ and (1) is established. Combined with [8, theorem III.12.11(b)], also (2) follows. Finally, for $a_i \geq 1$, we clearly have $H^0(\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(a_i - 1)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(a_i)$ is surjective. Thus (3) holds and the claim is proved. Now $(\pi_1)^*F \otimes (\pi_2)^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$ is π_1 -relatively ample. Since E is a quotient of $(\pi_1)^*F \otimes (\pi_2)^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$, we conclude that E is also π_1 -relatively ample.

The converse result follows in the same way. $\square$

Lemma 2.7. *With notation as in lemma 2.4, there exists an open subscheme $U : U \rightarrow T$ with the following property: for every morphism $f : T' \rightarrow T$, $f(T')$ is contained in U iff E' is π' -relatively deformation ample.*

Proof. By [6, section 8.5.2, proposition 8.9.1], we may reduce to the case that T and T' are Noetherian affine schemes.

Let $Z_1 \subset T$ be the closed subset with is the image under f of the support of $\text{coker}(\pi^*\pi_*E \rightarrow E)$. Let $Z_2 \subset T$ be the closed subset which is the support of $R^1\pi_*(E(K_\pi))$. Let $i : U \rightarrow T$ be the open complement of $Z_1 \cup Z_2$.

Suppose $f : T' \rightarrow T$ is a morphism of schemes. By [8, theorem III.12.11, prop. III.9.3] and Nakayama's lemma, $R^1\pi'_*(E'(K'))$ is identically zero iff for each $t' \in T'$ with $t = f(t')$, we have $H^1(B_t, E(K)|_{B_t})$ is zero, i.e. if t is contained in the complement of Z_2 . So $R^1\pi'_*(E'(K'))$ is identically zero iff $f(T)$ is contained in the complement of Z_2 . If $R^1\pi'_*(E'(K'))$ is zero, then also $R^1\pi'_*(E')$ is zero (by the same argument as in the proof of lemma 2.5). So using [8, theorem III.12.11, prop. III.9.3] again, E' is π' -relatively generated by global sections iff for each $t' \in T'$ with $t = f(t')$, we have E_t is generated by global sections, i.e. t is in the complement of Z_1 . So we conclude that E' is π' -relatively deformation ample iff $f(T)$ is contained in the complement of $Z_1 \cup Z_2$. $\square$

Lemma 2.8. *With notation as in definition 2.4:*

1. *If $E_1 \rightarrow E_2$ is a morphism of locally free sheaves on B whose cokernel is torsion in every fiber (in particular, if the morphism is surjective), if E_2 is nonzero, and if E_1 is π -relatively deformation ample, then also E_2 is π -relatively deformation ample.*
2. *Given a short exact sequence of nonzero locally free sheaves on B ,*

$$0 \longrightarrow E_1 \longrightarrow E_2 \longrightarrow E_3 \longrightarrow 0 \quad (6)$$
if E_1 and E_3 are π -relatively deformation ample, then E_2 is also π -relatively deformation ample.
3. *If E is π -relatively deformation ample, then for each integer $n \geq 1$, also $E^{\otimes n}$ is π -relatively deformation ample.*

Proof. First we prove (1). Let Q denote the cokernel, which is assumed to be torsion. Now $R^1\pi_*$ is right exact on coherent sheaves, $R^1\pi_*(Q(K))$ is zero (because $Q(K)$ is torsion in fibers), and $R^1\pi_*(E_1(K)) = 0$ by assumption. So we conclude that also $R^1\pi_*(E_2(K)) = 0$. Let $I \subset E_2$ denote the image sheaf of $E_1 \rightarrow E_2$. The surjective composition map

$$\pi^*\pi_*E_1 \longrightarrow E_1 \longrightarrow I \quad (7)$$

factors through $\pi^*\pi_*I \rightarrow I$. Therefore I is π -relatively generated by global sections. In particular, $R^1\pi_*I$ is zero (because $R^1\pi_*\mathcal{O}_B$ is zero). Since Q is fiberwise torsion, it is π -relatively generated by global sections. Now we have a short exact sequence of coherent sheaves:

$$0 \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow E_2 \longrightarrow Q \longrightarrow 0. \quad (8)$$

Applying the long exact sequence of higher direct images, and using that $R^1\pi_*I$ is zero, locally on B all global sections of Q lift to global sections of E_2 . Since also I is π -relatively generated by global sections, we conclude that E_2 is π -relatively generated by global sections. Thus E_2 is π -relatively deformation ample.

Next we prove (2). The long exact sequence of higher direct images and the vanishings $R^1\pi_*(E_1(K)) = R^1\pi_*(E_3(K)) = 0$ imply that $R^1\pi_*(E_2(K))$ is also trivial. Now E_1 and E_3 are π -relatively generated by global sections and so (locally on T) they are quotients of a trivial sheaf $\mathcal{O}_B^{\oplus N}$. Since $R^1\pi_*\mathcal{O}_B$ is zero, and since $R^1\pi_*$ is right exact for short exact sequences of coherent sheaves, we conclude that $R^1\pi_*E_1 = R^1\pi_*E_3 = 0$. Applying the long exact sequence of higher direct images to the short exact sequence above, we conclude that $\pi_*(E_2) \rightarrow \pi_*(E_3)$ is surjective. Since E_3 is π -relatively generated by global sections, we conclude that

$\pi^*\pi_*E_2 \rightarrow E_2 \rightarrow E_3$ is surjective. Therefore the map from E_1 to the cokernel of $\pi^*\pi_*E_2 \rightarrow E_2$ is surjective. But since E_1 is π -relatively generated by global sections, this map is zero and we conclude $\pi^*\pi_*E_2 \rightarrow E_2$ is surjective. So E_2 is π -relatively deformation ample.

Finally we prove (3) by induction on n . It suffices to consider the case when T is affine. For $n = 1$ it is trivial. Suppose $n > 1$ and suppose the result is known for all smaller values of n . In particular, $E^{\otimes(n-1)}$ is π -relatively generated by global sections, and we have a natural surjection

$$\pi_*\pi^*(E^{\otimes(n-1)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} E \rightarrow E^{\otimes n}. \quad (9)$$

Now we can find a surjective map $\mathcal{O}_T^{\oplus r} \rightarrow \pi_*(E^{\otimes(n-1)})$. Thus we have a surjection $E^{\oplus r} \rightarrow E^{\otimes n}$. By (2) above and induction, we have that $E^{\oplus r}$ is π -relatively deformation ample. By (1) above, we conclude that $E^{\otimes n}$ is π -relatively deformation ample, and we have proved (3) by induction on n . $\square$

Lemma 2.9. *Suppose now that $T = \text{Spec } k$ for some algebraically closed field k . If E satisfies the hypotheses*

1. *For every irreducible component $B_i \subset B$ we have $E|_{B_i}$ is generated by global sections, and*
2. *for some nonempty closed subcurve $B' \subset B$, $E|_{B'}$ is deformation ample,*

then E is deformation ample.

Proof. Let δ be the number of irreducible components of B which aren't contained in B' . We prove the result by induction on δ . If $\delta = 0$, then $B = B'$ and there is nothing to prove. Thus suppose that $\delta > 0$ and suppose the result has been proved for all smaller values of δ .

Let $B_1 \subset B$ be an irreducible component of B which is not in B' , let $B_2 \subset B$ denote the union of all irreducible components other than B_1 , and suppose that B_1 intersects B_2 in precisely one node p of B . By the induction assumption $E|_{B_2}$ is deformation ample.

First we prove that E is generated by global sections. Let $F \subset E$ be the image of $H^0(B, E) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_B \rightarrow E$. We have a short exact sequence of coherent sheaves:

$$0 \longrightarrow E|_{B_1}(-p) \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow E|_{B_2} \longrightarrow 0. \quad (10)$$

Since $E|_{B_1}$ is a locally free sheaf on $\mathbb{P}^1$ generated by global sections, Grothendieck's lemma and cohomology of line bundles on $\mathbb{P}^1$ imply that $H^1(B, E|_{B_1}(-p)) = 0$. Thus all the global sections of $E|_{B_2}$ lift to global sections of E , i.e. $F \rightarrow E|_{B_2}$ is surjective. So E/F is supported on B_1 and thus is a quotient of $E|_{B_1}$. Since $E|_{B_1}$ is generated by global sections, also E/F is generated by global sections. We have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow E/F \longrightarrow 0. \quad (11)$$

Since $H^1(B, \mathcal{O}_B) = 0$, also $H^1(B, H^0(B, E) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_B) = 0$. Since $H^1(B, *)$ is right exact, $H^1(B, F) = 0$. Thus all the global sections of E/F lift to global sections of E . This can only hold if $E/F = 0$, i.e. if E is generated by global sections.

Next we prove that $H^1(B, E(K_B)) = 0$. We have a short exact sequence of sheaves:

$$0 \longrightarrow E(K_B)|_{B_2}(-p) \longrightarrow E(K_B) \longrightarrow E(K_B)|_{B_1} \longrightarrow 0. \quad (12)$$

This gives an exact sequence of vector spaces:

$$H^1(B, E(K_B)|_{B_2}(-p)) \longrightarrow H^1(B, E(K_B)) \longrightarrow H^1(B, E(K_B)|_{B_1}) \longrightarrow 0. \quad (13)$$

By standard results on dualizing sheaves and finite morphisms, we have

$$K_{B_2} = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_B}(\mathcal{O}_{B_2}, K_B) = K_B|_{B_2}(-p). \quad (14)$$

Therefore $H^1(B, E(K_B)|_{B_2}(-p)) = H^1(B_2, E|_{B_2}(K_{B_2}))$, which is zero by the induction assumption. Similarly, $E(K_B)|_{B_1}$ equals $E|_{B_1}(-1)$ (identifying B_1 with $\mathbb{P}^1$). Since $E|_{B_1}$ is generated by global sections, it follows by Grothendieck's lemma and cohomology of line bundles on $\mathbb{P}^1$ that $H^1(B_1, E|_{B_1}(-1))$ is trivial. Therefore we conclude that $H^1(B, E(K_B))$ is trivial. So E is deformation ample, and the result is proved by induction on δ . $\square$

Remark 2.10. A particular case of lemma 2.9 is when B' is one irreducible component of B . Then the lemma says that a locally free sheaf on B which is *generically ample* in the sense of Lazarsfeld [5] is deformation ample.

3. SOME DEFORMATION THEORY

In the next section we will need some deformation theory of stable maps.

Notation 3.1. Suppose T is a scheme and suppose

$$\zeta = ((\pi : B \rightarrow T, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r), g : B \rightarrow X) \quad (15)$$

is a family of marked prestable maps to a smooth scheme X . Denote by L_ζ the complex of coherent sheaves on B

$$\begin{array}{ccc} -1 & & 0 \\ f^*\Omega_X & \xrightarrow{(df)^\dagger} & \Omega_\pi(\sigma_1 + \dots + \sigma_r) \end{array} \quad (16)$$

Denote by $L_\zeta^\vee$ the object

$$L_\zeta^\vee := \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_B}(L_\zeta, \mathcal{O}_B) \quad (17)$$

in the derived category of B .

The relevance of the complex $L_\zeta^\vee$ is the following.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose X is a smooth projective scheme. Let $\pi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, \beta)$ denote the universal curve, let $\sigma_i : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ denote the universal sections, and let $f : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow X$ denote the universal map, i.e.*

$$\zeta = ((\pi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, \beta), \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r), f : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow X) \quad (18)$$

is the universal family of stable maps. There is an obstruction theory for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, \beta)$ in the sense of [2, definition 4.4] of the form

$$\phi : (\mathbb{R}\pi_*(L_\zeta^\vee[1]))^\vee \rightarrow L_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, \beta)}. \quad (19)$$

Proof. Essentially this follows from [2] and [1]. $\square$

Remark 3.3. Explicitly, if $\zeta = ((B, p_1, \dots, p_r), f : B \rightarrow X)$ is a stable map (i.e $T = \text{Spec } C$), then the space of first order deformations of ζ is given by $\mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^1(L_\zeta, \mathcal{O}_B)$ and the obstruction group is a subgroup of $\mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^2(L_\zeta, \mathcal{O}_B)$. In particular, if $\mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^2(L_\zeta, \mathcal{O}_B)$ vanishes, then $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, \beta)$ is smooth at the point $[\zeta]$.

3.1. Contracting unstable components. In this subsection we wish to investigate the relationship between $\mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}(L_\zeta, \mathcal{O}_B)$ and $\mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_{B'}}(L'_\zeta, \mathcal{O}'_B)$ where

$$\zeta = ((B, p_1, \dots, p_r), f : B \rightarrow X) \quad (20)$$

is a prestable map, where

$$(B', p'_1, \dots, p'_r, q'_1, \dots, q'_s) \quad (21)$$

is a prestable curve, where

$$h : (B', p'_1, \dots, p'_r) \rightarrow (B, p_1, \dots, p_r) \quad (22)$$

is a map which contracts some of the unstable components of $(B', p_1, \dots, p_r)$, where $f' = f \circ h$ and where ζ' is the prestable map

$$\zeta' = ((B', p'_1, \dots, p'_r, q'_1, \dots, q'_s), f' : B' \rightarrow X). \quad (23)$$

Any morphism $h : B' \rightarrow B$ as above can be factored as a sequence of *elementary* maps. We begin by analyzing the case $\zeta = (B, f : B \rightarrow X)$ is a prestable map without marked points, $h : B' \rightarrow B$ contracts a single unstable component, and $\zeta' = (B', f' = f \circ h : B' \rightarrow X)$ (again without marked points). We call such maps either *type I* or *type II*, depending on whether the image under h of the contracted component is a smooth point of B or a node of B . After this, we analyze the case where $\zeta = (B, (p_1, \dots, p_n), f : B \rightarrow X)$ is a marked prestable map, where B' is the same prestable map, but with one extra marked point, and where $h : B' \rightarrow B$ is the identity map. We call such a map *type III*.

To simplify calculations, we replace L_ζ by a quasi-isomorphic complex as follows. Choose a regular embedding $i : B \rightarrow S$ of B into a smooth surface S . Then the morphism $(f, i) : B \rightarrow X \times S$ is a regular embedding. Let $N_{(f,i)}$ denote the normal bundle of the embedding. There are induced morphisms $\alpha_f : N_{(f,i)}^\vee \rightarrow f^*\Omega_X$ and $\beta_i : N_{(f,i)}^\vee \rightarrow i^*\Omega_S$ which are the components of the canonical morphism $N_{(f,i)}^\vee \rightarrow (f, i)^*\Omega_{X \times S}$. Define the complex $L_{(f,i)}$ to be

$$\begin{array}{ccc} -1 & & 0 \\ N_{(f,i)}^\vee & \xrightarrow{\beta_i} & i^*\Omega_S \end{array} \quad (24)$$

There is a map of complexes $\gamma_{(f,i)} : L_{(f,i)} \rightarrow L_\zeta$ defined by the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N_{(f,i)}^\vee & \xrightarrow{\beta_i} & i^*\Omega_S \\ \alpha_f \downarrow & & \downarrow (di)^\dagger \\ f^*\Omega_X & \xrightarrow{(df)^\dagger} & \Omega_B \end{array} \quad (25)$$

Lemma 3.4. *The morphism $\gamma_{(f,i)} : L_{(f,i)} \rightarrow L_\zeta$ is a quasi-isomorphism of complexes.*

Proof. This is an easy local argument which is left as an exercise for the reader. $\square$

As a corollary of the lemma, we see that $L_\zeta^\vee$ is represented in $D(\mathcal{O}_B)$ by the complex $L_{(f,i)}^\vee$ defined to be

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & & 1 \\ i^*T_S & \xrightarrow{(\beta_i)^\vee} & N_{(f,i)} \end{array} \quad (26)$$

Now suppose that $p \in B \subset S$ is a point, define $g : S' \rightarrow S$ to be the blow up of S at p with exceptional divisor E , and define $i' : B' \rightarrow S'$ to be the reduced total transform of B .

We break up our analysis according to the type of behavior of $p \in B$. If $p \in B$ is a smooth point, we call this *type (I)*. If $p \in B$ is a node, we call this *type (II)*. We further decompose each type as follows. If $p \in B$ is a smooth point which lies on a stable component, we say this is *type (Ia)*. If $p \in B$ is a smooth point which lies on an unstable component, we say this is *type (Ib)*. If $p \in B$ is a node, and the first order deformations of ζ smooth the node, we say this is *type (IIa)*. If the first order deformations of ζ don't smooth the node, we say this is *type (IIb)*.

For type (I), we have g^*B equals B' as Cartier divisors. For type (II), we have g^*B equals $B' + E$ as Cartier divisors. For both types, we define $h : B' \rightarrow B$ to be the restriction of g and we define $f' : B' \rightarrow B$ to be $f' = f \circ h$.

Of course we have $g_*\mathcal{O}_{S'} = \mathcal{O}_S$ and $R^{k>0}g_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}$ is zero. For type (I), we have $\mathcal{O}_{S'}(-B') = g^*\mathcal{O}_S(-B)$. So by the projection formula we have $g_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}(-B') = \mathcal{O}_S(-B)$ and $R^{k>0}g_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}(-B')$ is zero. Also we have that $g_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}(E) = \mathcal{O}_S$ and $R^{k>0}g_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}(E)$ is zero. So also for type (II) we have $g_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}(-B') = \mathcal{O}_S(-B)$ and $R^{k>0}g_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}(-B')$ is zero.

Using the resolution of $\mathcal{O}_{B'}$

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{S'}(-B') \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{S'} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{B'} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (27)$$

we conclude that $h_*\mathcal{O}_{B'} = \mathcal{O}_B$ and $R^{k>0}h_*\mathcal{O}_{B'}$ is zero. In other words, the canonical morphism $\mathcal{O}_B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}h_*\mathcal{O}_{B'}$ is a quasi-isomorphism. From this it follows by the projection formula that the canonical morphism

$$L_{(f,i)}^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{R}h_*\mathbb{L}h^*(L_{(f,i)}^\vee) \quad (28)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. Therefore the pullback morphisms

$$\mathbb{H}^k(B, L_\zeta^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^k(B', g^*L_\zeta^\vee) \quad (29)$$

are isomorphisms.

Now there is a canonical morphism $\mathcal{O}_{S'}(B') \rightarrow g^*\mathcal{O}_S(B)$. For type (I), this morphism is an isomorphism. For type (II), this morphism is injective and the cokernel is $g^*\mathcal{O}_S(B)|_E$, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_E \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M$ where $M = \mathcal{O}_S(B)|_p$ is a one-dimensional vector space. For type (I), we conclude that the canonical morphism $N_{(f',i')} \rightarrow h^*N_{(f,i)}$ is an isomorphism. For type (II), we conclude that there is an exact

sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^{\mathcal{O}_{S'}}(\mathcal{O}_{B'}, \mathcal{O}_E) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M \rightarrow N_{(f', i')} \rightarrow h^* N_{(f, i)} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_E \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M \rightarrow 0 \quad (30)$$

For both types, denote by $\Gamma \subset B'$ the subcurve which is the union of all components other than E , and let $D = E \cap \Gamma$. From the resolution of $\mathcal{O}_E$

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{S'}(-E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_S \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_E \longrightarrow 0 \quad (31)$$

we have the relation

$$\text{Tor}_1^{\mathcal{O}_{S'}}(\mathcal{O}_{B'}, \mathcal{O}_E) = \mathcal{I}_{\Gamma} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S'}} \mathcal{O}_{S'}(-E) = \mathcal{O}_E(-E)(-D). \quad (32)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_{\Gamma}$ is the ideal sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_{B'}$ defining $\Gamma \subset B'$, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_E(-D)$. So in case (2), we have an exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_E(-E)(-D) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M \rightarrow N_{(f', i')} \rightarrow h^* N_{(f, i)} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_E \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M \rightarrow 0. \quad (33)$$

For both types, we have a short exact sequence of $\mathcal{O}_{S'}$ -modules

$$0 \longrightarrow g^* \Omega_S \xrightarrow{(dg)^\dagger} \Omega_{S'} \longrightarrow \Omega_E \longrightarrow 0. \quad (34)$$

Applying $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{S'}}(*, \mathcal{O}_{S'})$, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T_{S'} \longrightarrow g^* T_S \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_{S'}}^1(\mathcal{O}_E, \mathcal{O}_{S'}) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (35)$$

Using the resolution of $\mathcal{O}_E$ in the last paragraph, we have that

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_{S'}}^1(\mathcal{O}_E, \mathcal{O}_{S'}) = \mathcal{O}_E(E). \quad (36)$$

So we have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T_{S'} \longrightarrow g^* T_S \longrightarrow T_E(E) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (37)$$

Using our Tor result from the last paragraph, we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow T_E(-D) \rightarrow (i')^* T_{S'} \xrightarrow{dg} h^* i^* T_S \rightarrow T_E(E) \rightarrow 0. \quad (38)$$

Notice this holds in both cases.

The maps $N_{(f', i')} \rightarrow h^* N_{(f, i)}$ and $(i')^* T_{S'} \rightarrow h^* i^* T_S$ considered in the last two paragraphs are compatible with $\alpha_{i'}$ and $h^* \alpha_i$. So we have an induced map of complexes $dg : L_{\zeta'}^\vee \rightarrow h^* L_\zeta^\vee$. Define $I \hookrightarrow h^* L_\zeta^\vee$ to be the image complex of $dg : L_{\zeta'}^\vee \rightarrow h^* L_\zeta^\vee$. For type (I), we define two complexes of coherent sheaves on B' , K_I and Q_I , by $K_I = T_E(-D)[0]$ and $Q_I = T_E(E)[0]$. For type (II), we define complexes of coherent sheaves on B' , K_{II} and Q_{II} by

$$K_{II} = T_E(-D)[0] \oplus (\mathcal{O}_E(-E)(-D) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M)[-1] \quad (39)$$

$$Q_{II} = T_E(E)[0] \oplus (\mathcal{O}_E \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M)[-1] \quad (40)$$

Then we have exact sequences of complexes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\longrightarrow K \longrightarrow L_{\zeta'}^\vee \xrightarrow{dg} I \longrightarrow 0 \\ 0 &\longrightarrow I \longrightarrow h^* L_\zeta^\vee \longrightarrow Q \longrightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

For type (I), we have that $\mathbb{H}^0(B', K_I) = H^0(E, T_E(-D))$ is 2-dimensional, because $T_E(-D) \cong \mathcal{O}_E(1)$. And $\mathbb{H}^{k>0}(B', K_I)$ is zero. Similarly $\mathbb{H}^0(B', Q_I) =$

$H^0(E, T_E(E))$ is 2-dimensional and $\mathbb{H}^{k>0}(B', Q_I)$ is zero. Therefore we have a long exact sequence of hypercohomology groups:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(-D)) &\rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow \dots \\ \dots \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(E)) &\rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \\ 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) &\rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

For type (Ia), the map

$$\mathbb{H}^0(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(E)) \quad (42)$$

is the zero map. So we have proved the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that $h : B' \rightarrow B$ is type (Ia). Then we have exact sequences:*

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(-D)) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \quad (43)$$

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(E)) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \quad (44)$$

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \quad (45)$$

So the canonical map from the Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of ζ' to the Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of ζ is surjective with 2-dimensional kernel, the canonical map from the space of first order deformations of ζ' to the space of first order deformations of ζ is surjective with 2-dimensional kernel, and the obstruction space of ζ' equals the obstruction space of ζ .

For type (Ib), the map

$$\mathbb{H}^0(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(E)) \quad (46)$$

has a 1-dimensional image; we will call it N . We have proved the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that $h : B' \rightarrow B$ is type (Ib). Then there is a 1-dimensional subspace $N \subset H^0(E, T_E(E))$ such that we have exact sequences:*

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(-D)) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0 \quad (47)$$

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(E))/N \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \quad (48)$$

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \quad (49)$$

So the canonical map from the Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of ζ' to the Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of ζ has both 1-dimensional kernel and cokernel, the canonical map from the space of first order deformations of ζ' to the space of first order deformations of ζ is surjective with 1-dimensional kernel, and the obstruction space of ζ' equals the obstruction space of ζ .

Next we consider type (II). Then $\mathcal{O}_E(-E)(-D)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_E(-1)$. Since $H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E(-1)) = H^1(E, \mathcal{O}_E(-1)) = 0$, the terms $\mathcal{O}_E(-E)(-D) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M[-1]$ do not contribute to the hypercohomology of K_{II} . And $T_E(-D)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_E$. So we have $\mathbb{H}^0(B', K_{II}) = H^0(E, T_E(-D))$ is 1-dimensional and $\mathbb{H}^{k>0}(B', K_{II})$ is zero.

For Q_{II} both terms contribute to the cohomology. We have $T_E(E)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_E(1)$ so that $\mathbb{H}^0(B', Q_{II}) = H^0(E, T_E(E))$ is 2-dimensional, and

$\mathbb{H}^1(B', Q_{II}) = M = \mathcal{O}_S(B)|_p$ is 1-dimensional. Therefore we have a long exact sequence in hypercohomology:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(-D)) &\rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow \dots \\ \dots \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(E)) &\rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow \dots \\ \dots \rightarrow M &\rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

Geometrically, every infinitesimal automorphism of ζ lifts to an infinitesimal automorphism of ζ' , so that $\mathbb{H}^0(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(E))$ is the zero map. Similarly, the map $\mathbb{H}^1(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_S(B)|_p$ is nonzero iff there are deformations of ζ which smooth the node p to first order. So we have the following lemma:

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that $h : B' \rightarrow B$ is type (IIa). Then we have exact sequences:*

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(-D)) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \quad (50)$$

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(E)) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_S(B)|_p \rightarrow 0 \quad (51)$$

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \quad (52)$$

So the canonical map from the space of first order deformations of ζ' to the space of first order deformations of ζ has both 1-dimensional kernel and cokernel, and the obstruction space to ζ' equals the obstruction space to ζ .

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose that $h : B' \rightarrow B$ is type (IIb). Then we have exact sequences:*

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(-D)) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \quad (53)$$

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(E, T_E(E)) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \quad (54)$$

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_S(B)|_p \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B', L_{(f', i')}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(B, L_{(f, i)}^\vee) \rightarrow 0 \quad (55)$$

So the canonical map from the space of first order deformations of ζ' to the space of first order deformations of ζ is surjective with 1-dimensional kernel, and the map from the obstruction space of ζ' to the obstruction space of ζ is surjective and has a 1-dimensional kernel.

Finally, we consider the case when $h : B' \rightarrow B$ is the identity map, but there is one extra marked point $q \in B'$ which is not in B ; we call this *type (III)*. We further break this up as follows. If $q \in B$ lies on an unstable component, we call this *type (IIIa)*. If $q \in B$ lies on a stable component, we call this *type (IIIb)*.

For type (III), there is a canonical short exact sequence of complexes:

$$0 \longrightarrow L_\zeta \longrightarrow L'_\zeta \longrightarrow \Omega_B(q)|_q[0] \longrightarrow 0 \quad (56)$$

Of course we have:

$$\mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^0(\Omega_B(q)|_q[0], \mathcal{O}_B) = 0, \quad (57)$$

$$\mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^1(\Omega_B(q)|_q[0], \mathcal{O}_B) = T_B|_q, \quad (58)$$

$$\mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^2(\Omega_B(q)|_q[0], \mathcal{O}_B) = 0. \quad (59)$$

The induced map $\mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^0(L_\zeta, \mathcal{O}_B) \rightarrow T_B|_q$ is nonzero iff q lies on an unstable component of ζ . Thus we have the following lemma:

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose that $h : B' \rightarrow B$ is type (IIIa). Then we have exact sequences:*

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_{B'}}^0(L_{\zeta'}, \mathcal{O}_{B'}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^0(L_{\zeta}, \mathcal{O}_B) \rightarrow T_B|_q \rightarrow 0 \quad (60)$$

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_{B'}}^1(L_{\zeta'}, \mathcal{O}_{B'}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^1(L_{\zeta}, \mathcal{O}_B) \rightarrow 0 \quad (61)$$

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_{B'}}^2(L_{\zeta'}, \mathcal{O}_{B'}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^2(L_{\zeta}, \mathcal{O}_B) \rightarrow 0 \quad (62)$$

So the Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of ζ' has codimension 1 in the Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of ζ , the space of first order deformations of ζ' equals the space of first order deformations of ζ , and the obstruction space of ζ' equals the obstruction space of ζ .

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose that $h : B' \rightarrow B$ is type (IIIb). Then we have exact sequences:*

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_{B'}}^0(L_{\zeta'}, \mathcal{O}_{B'}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^0(L_{\zeta}, \mathcal{O}_B) \rightarrow 0 \quad (63)$$

$$0 \rightarrow T_B|_q \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_{B'}}^1(L_{\zeta'}, \mathcal{O}_{B'}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^1(L_{\zeta}, \mathcal{O}_B) \rightarrow 0 \quad (64)$$

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_{B'}}^2(L_{\zeta'}, \mathcal{O}_{B'}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^2(L_{\zeta}, \mathcal{O}_B) \rightarrow 0 \quad (65)$$

So the Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of ζ' equals the Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of ζ , the canonical map from the space of first order deformations of ζ' to the space of first order deformations of ζ is surjective with 1-dimensional kernel, and the obstruction space of ζ' equals the obstruction space of ζ .

Combining lemma 3.5 through lemma 3.10, one can analyze the associated maps of vector spaces $\mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_{B'}}^k(L_{\zeta'}, \mathcal{O}_{B'}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_B}^k(L_{\zeta}, \mathcal{O}_B)$ for any morphism $h : B' \rightarrow B$ which removes some subset of marked points from B' and then contracts some subset of the unstable components.

3.2. Gluing stable curves. Just as one has an obstruction theory for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, \beta)$ of the form $\left(\mathbb{R}\pi_* \left(L_{\zeta}^{\vee}\right) [1]\right)^{\vee}$, also for any stable A -graph τ , one has an analogous obstruction theory for each of the Behrend-Manin stacks $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$ (c.f. [3] for the definition of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$). We will not describe this obstruction theory here. In [1], a *relative obstruction theory* for the morphism $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\tau)$ is given from which an absolute obstruction theory for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$ can be deduced.

Suppose that τ is a stable A -graph, and suppose that $\{f_1, f_2\}$ is a disconnecting edge of τ . Let $\tau_1 \subset \tau$ be the maximal connected subgraph which contains f_1 and not f_2 , and let $\tau_2 \subset \tau$ be the maximal connected subgraph which contains f_2 and not f_1 . So we have forgetful 1-morphisms $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Lemma 3.11. *Suppose that $\zeta : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$ is a 1-morphism and let $\zeta_i : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau_i)$, $i = 1, 2$ be the composition of ζ with the forgetful 1-morphism above. Suppose that for each point $t \in T$, the stable maps $\zeta_1(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau_1)$ and $\zeta_2(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau_2)$ are unobstructed (in the sense that the obstruction groups described above are zero) and the evaluation morphism $ev_{f_1} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau_1) \rightarrow X$ is smooth at $\zeta_1(t)$. Let $T_{ev_{f_1}}$ denote the dual of the sheaf of relative differentials of ev_{f_1} . Then also $\zeta(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$ is unobstructed, and there is a short exact sequence:*

$$0 \longrightarrow \zeta_1^* T_{ev_{f_1}} \longrightarrow \zeta^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)} \longrightarrow \zeta_2^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau_2)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (66)$$

Proof. The proof essentially follows from the fact that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$ is an open substack of the 2-fiber product:

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau_1) \times_{\text{ev}_{f_1}, X, \text{ev}_{f_2}} \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau_2). \quad (67)$$

The details are left to the reader. $\square$

Now suppose that $\phi : \tau \rightarrow \sigma$ is the contraction of stable A -graphs which contracts the edge $\{f_1, f_2\}$. The induced 1-morphism $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)$ is unramified of codimension at most 1. In some circumstances, it is the normalization of a Cartier divisor.

Lemma 3.12. *With the same notation as in lemma 3.11, suppose that τ is a genus 0 tree. For $i = 1, 2$, let the domain of ζ_i be given by $\pi_i : C_i \rightarrow T$, let $g_i : C_i \rightarrow X$ be the map of ζ_i , and let $s_i : T \rightarrow C_i$ be the section corresponding to the flag f_i of τ_i . Denote by T_{π_i} the dual of the sheaf of relative differentials of π_i .*

Suppose that for every point $t \in T$, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau_2)$ is unobstructed at $\zeta_2(t)$, and suppose that $g_1^*T_X$ is π_1 -relatively generated by global sections. Then for each point $t \in T$, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)$ is unobstructed at $\zeta(t)$, the morphism $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)$ is a regular embedding of codimension 1 at $\zeta(t)$, and we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \zeta^*T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)} \longrightarrow \zeta^*T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)} \longrightarrow s_1^*T_{\pi_1} \otimes s_2^*T_{\pi_2} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (68)$$

Proof. Let $\pi : C \rightarrow T$ be the family of curves obtained by identifying the section s_1 of π_1 and the section s_2 of π_2 . Let $s : T \rightarrow C$ be the section corresponding to s_1 and s_2 . Let $g : C \rightarrow X$ be the map obtained by gluing g_1 and g_2 .

First we prove that for any point $t \in T$ we have that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)$ is unobstructed at $\zeta(t)$ and the morphism $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)$ is a regular embedding of codimension 1. The two statements together are equivalent to the statement that there are first order deformations of the map $\zeta(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)$ which smooth the node $s(t) \in C_t$.

Now there is an exact sequence for $\zeta(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)$:

$$T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)}|_{\zeta(t)} \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_{C_t}, \mathcal{O}_{C_t}) \rightarrow H^1(C_t, g^*T_X) \rightarrow \text{Obs}(\zeta(t)) \rightarrow 0 \quad (69)$$

Here $\text{Obs}(\zeta)$ is the obstruction group to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)$ at ζ . Similarly, we have an exact sequence for $\zeta_2(t)$:

$$T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau_2)}|_{\zeta_2(t)} \longrightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_{(C_2)_t}) \longrightarrow H^1((C_2)_t, g_2^*T_X) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (70)$$

We have a short exact sequence of sheaves on C_t :

$$0 \longrightarrow g_1^*T_X(-s(t)) \longrightarrow g^*T_X \longrightarrow g_2^*T_X \longrightarrow 0 \quad (71)$$

By assumption, $g_1^*T_X$ is generated by global sections. Thus by lemma 2.1, we conclude that $H^1(C_t, g_1^*T_X(-s(t)))$ is zero. Thus we have an identification of $H^1(C_t, g^*T_X)$ and $H^1((C_2)_t, g_2^*T_X)$. Also, $\text{Ext}^1(\Omega_{C_t}, \mathcal{O}_{C_t})$ is canonically isomorphic to the product over all nodes $q \in C_t$ of $T'_q \otimes T''_q$ where T'_q and T''_q are the tangent spaces to the two branches of C_t at q . We have the analogous result for

$(C_2)_t$. Via these identifications, we have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Omega_{C_t}, \mathcal{O}_{C_t}) & \longrightarrow & H^1(C_t, g^*T_X) \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow = \\ \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Omega_{(C_2)_t}, \mathcal{O}_{(C_2)_t}) & \longrightarrow & H^1((C_2)_t, g_2^*T_X) \end{array} \quad (72)$$

where p is the canonical projection. Choose any section

$$\phi : T'_{s(t)} \otimes T''_{s(t)} \rightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Omega_{C_t}, \mathcal{O}_{C_t}) \quad (73)$$

and any section

$$\psi : \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Omega_{(C_2)_t}, \mathcal{O}_{(C_2)_t}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Omega_{C_t}, \mathcal{O}_{C_t}) \quad (74)$$

of the canonical projections. Choose any element $u \in T'_{s(t)} \otimes T''_{s(t)}$ and consider the image $\overline{\phi(u)}$ of $\phi(u)$ in $H^1(C_t, g^*T_X)$. Since the map

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Omega_{(C_2)_t}, \mathcal{O}_{(C_2)_t}) \longrightarrow H^1((C_2)_t, g_2^*T_X) \quad (75)$$

is surjective, we can find some element $v \in \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Omega_{(C_2)_t}, \mathcal{O}_{(C_2)_t})$ such that $\overline{\psi(v)}$ equals $\overline{\phi(u)}$. Consider $\phi(u) - \psi(v)$. This has image 0 in $H^1(C_t, g^*T_X)$. Therefore we conclude that it is in the image of $T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)|_{\zeta(t)}}$. So we conclude that u is in the image of the projection map $T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)} \rightarrow T'_{s(t)} \otimes T''_{s(t)}$, i.e. this projection map is surjective. So the deformations of $\zeta(t)$ smooth the node $s(t)$. Therefore $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)$ is smooth at $\zeta(t)$ and the morphism $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)$ is a regular embedding of codimension 1 at $\zeta(t)$.

Finally, the short exact sequence above is just the globalized version of the projection map $T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \sigma)} \rightarrow T'_{s(t)} \otimes T''_{s(t)}$ appearing in the last paragraph. $\square$

4. PROPERTIES OF FAMILIES OF STABLE MAPS

In this section we introduce some definitions and lemmas regarding properties of families of stable maps. Recall, to prove that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is rationally connected, we have to find a *very free* 1-morphism $\zeta : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$, i.e. a 1-morphism whose image is contained in the smooth locus and such that $\zeta^*T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)}$ is an ample vector bundle. Our proof that such a 1-morphism exists is by induction, where the induction step consists of attaching a 1-parameter family of lines to our 1-parameter family of degree e stable maps. To make the induction argument work, we need a bit more than a very free 1-morphism $\zeta : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$. The property we need is what we call a *very positive* 1-morphism. Additionally, we need that our 1-parameter family of lines has a property which we call *very twisting*. Finally, because of an operation we perform on 1-morphisms which we call *modification*, and which we introduce in the next section, we need to consider the case of 1-morphisms with reducible domain, i.e. $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$ where B is a connected, prestable curve of arithmetic genus 0. This is the level of generality in which we make all our definitions.

Definition 4.1. Given a genus 0 stable map $\zeta = ((B, p_1, \dots, p_n), f : B \rightarrow X)$, we say ζ is *very stable* if the unmarked prestable map $(B, f : B \rightarrow X)$ is stable.

Notation 4.2. Given a closed subscheme $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ and a scheme B , a 1-morphism $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, e)$ is equivalent to a datum:

$$\zeta = ((p_\zeta : \Sigma_\zeta \rightarrow B, \sigma_{\zeta,1}, \dots, \sigma_{\zeta,r}), g_\zeta). \quad (76)$$

Here $p_\zeta : \Sigma_\zeta \rightarrow B$ is a family of prestable curves, $\sigma_{\zeta,i} : B \rightarrow \Sigma_\zeta$ is a collection of sections, $g_\zeta : \Sigma_\zeta \rightarrow X$ is a morphism of schemes and we denote $h_{\zeta,i} = g_\zeta \circ \sigma_{\zeta,i}$. When there is no risk of confusion, we will suppress the ζ subscripts.

Definition 4.3. Suppose $\pi : B \rightarrow T$ is a family of prestable, geometrically connected curves of arithmetic genus 0. Suppose given a 1-morphism $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$, i.e. a datum

$$\zeta = (p : \Sigma \rightarrow B, \sigma : B \rightarrow \Sigma, g : \Sigma \rightarrow X) \quad (77)$$

such that X is smooth along $g(\Sigma)$. The 1-morphism $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is *twisting* if

1. The data $(\pi : B \rightarrow T, h : B \rightarrow X)$ is a family of stable maps to X , i.e. a 1-morphism $\xi : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ for some $e \geq 0$.
2. The image of $\xi : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is contained in the *very unobstructed* locus of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X)$.
3. The image of $\zeta : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is contained in the *very unobstructed* locus of the evaluation morphism $\text{ev} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1) \rightarrow X$.
4. Denoting by T_{ev} the dual of the sheaf of relative differentials Ω_{ev} , the pullback bundle $\zeta^* T_{\text{ev}}$ is π -relatively generated by global sections.
5. Denoting by $\text{pr} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, 1)$ the projection map, and by T_{pr} the dual of the sheaf of relative differentials Ω_{pr} , the pullback bundle $\zeta^* T_{\text{pr}}$, i.e. the line bundle $\sigma^* \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma)$, is π -relatively generated by global sections.

Definition 4.4. With notation as in definition 4.3, a morphism $\zeta : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is *very twisting* if it is twisting and if $\zeta^* T_{\text{ev}}$ is π -relatively deformation ample.

Remark 4.5. Regarding the definitions above:

1. In (2) and (3) of definition 4.3, *very unobstructed* means that the naive obstruction group vanishes. For (2) this means that for each $t \in T$ and the corresponding stable map $(h_t : B_t \rightarrow X)$, the following group vanishes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} -1 & & 0 \\ \mathbb{E} \text{xt}_{B_t}^1(h_t^* \Omega_X & \longrightarrow & \Omega_{B_t}, \mathcal{O}_{B_t}) \end{array} \quad (78)$$

2. It is easy to see that $\zeta^* T_{\text{pr}}$ is just $\sigma^* \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma)$.
3. Observe the product morphism $(p, g) : \Sigma \rightarrow B \times X$ is a regular embedding. Denote by $\mathcal{N}$ the normal bundle of this regular embedding. Then (3) is equivalent to the condition that $R^1 p_* (\mathcal{N}(-\sigma))$ is trivial. In this case $\zeta^* T_{\text{ev}}$ is the locally free sheaf $p_* (\mathcal{N}(-\sigma))$.
4. Since the prestable family of maps $(\pi : B \rightarrow T, \xi : B \rightarrow X)$ is stable, clearly also $(\pi : B \rightarrow T, \zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1))$ is stable.
5. There are some degree conditions implicit in these definitions. The total degree of $\sigma^* \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ is simply $s = 2e - e'$ where e is the degree of $h : B \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ and e' is the degree of $g : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ (both degrees with respect to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(1)$). So

if ζ is twisting, we have that $2e \geq e'$ and if ζ is very twisting, we have that $2e > e'$.

6. Additionally, given a twisting family ζ a point $b \in B$, and a deformation of the line $g_b : \Sigma_b \rightarrow X$ which continues to contain $h(b)$, there must be a deformation of the whole family ζ giving rise to the deformation of Σ_b and which does not deform $h : B \rightarrow X$. In particular, if $h : B \rightarrow X$ is also an embedded line, then the map of the surface $g : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ must have degree 1 or 2 and must deform along with a line which intersects $h(B)$ in a fixed point. If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a hypersurface of low degree $d > 1$ such that to a general line $h : B \rightarrow X$ there is a corresponding twisting family ζ (what we refer to as a *twistable line* below), then we must have that $h : B \rightarrow X$ is an embedding of a smooth quadric surface. The condition on such X that a general line is *twistable* is essentially that, given two general intersecting lines B and L in X , there is a smooth quadric surface Σ in X which contains both B and L . In a later section we will see that this condition does hold for a general hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of degree d when $d^2 \leq n + 1$.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose $B = B_1 \cup B_2$ is a prestable, geometrically connected curve of arithmetic genus 0 where B_1 and B_2 are connected subcurves such that $B_1 \cap B_2$ is a single node of B . Suppose given $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ such that $\zeta|_{B_i} : B_i \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is twisting for $i = 1, 2$. Then ζ is twisting. If, in addition, at least one of ζ_i is very twisting, then ζ is very twisting.*

Proof. This is an easy consequence of lemma 2.9. $\square$

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\pi : B \rightarrow T$ be a family of prestable, geometrically connected curves of arithmetic genus 0 and let $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ be a morphism. There is an open subscheme $U_{\text{twist}} \subset T$ (resp. $U_{\text{vtwist}} \subset T$) with the following property: for any morphism of schemes $f : T' \rightarrow T$, the pullback family $f^*\pi : f^*B \rightarrow T'$ and $f^*\zeta : f^*B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is twisting (resp. very twisting) iff $f(T') \subset U_{\text{twist}}$ (resp. $f(T') \subset U_{\text{vtwist}}$).*

Proof. By [1, lemma 1] there is an universal open subscheme $U_1 \subset T$ over which $(\pi : B \rightarrow T, h : B \rightarrow X)$ is a family of stable maps. It is clear that U , if it exists, must also be contained in the complement of the support of

$$\mathbb{R}^1(\pi_* \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_B})(h^* \Omega_X \rightarrow \Omega_\pi, \mathcal{O}_B), \quad (79)$$

and in the complement of the image under π of the supports of the sheaves:

$$R^1 p_*(\mathcal{N}(-\sigma)), \quad (80)$$

$$\text{coker}(\pi^* \pi_* \sigma^* \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma) \rightarrow \sigma^* \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma)). \quad (81)$$

Let U_2 denote the complement of these sets in U_1 . On U_2 all of the conditions to be twisting (resp. very twisting) are satisfied except the condition that $\zeta^* T_{\text{ev}}$ is π -relatively generated by global sections (resp. π -relatively deformation ample). So we define U_{twist} to be the complement in U_2 of the image under π of the cokernel of the morphism

$$\pi^* \pi_* \zeta^* T_{\text{ev}} \rightarrow \zeta^* T_{\text{ev}}. \quad (82)$$

And, using lemma 2.7, we define U_{vtwist} to be the universal open subscheme of U_2 over which $\zeta^* T_{\text{ev}}$ is π -relatively deformation ample. It follows immediately from the construction that U_{twist} and U_{vtwist} have the desired universal properties. $\square$

Definition 4.8. Suppose $(\pi : B \rightarrow T, h : B \rightarrow X)$ is a family of genus 0 stable maps, i.e. a 1-morphism $\xi : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ for some $e \geq 0$. We say $\xi : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is *twistable* (resp. *very twistable*) if there exists a surjective étale morphism $u : T' \rightarrow T$ and a morphism $\zeta : u^*B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ with $h_\zeta = u^*h$ such that ζ is twisting (resp. very twisting).

Proposition 4.9. *Let $\xi = (\pi : B \rightarrow T, h : B \rightarrow X)$ be a 1-morphism $\xi : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$. There is an open subscheme $U_{t\text{-able}} \subset T$ (resp $U_{vt\text{-able}} \subset T$) such that for each morphism of schemes $f : T' \rightarrow T$, the pullback $(f^*\pi : f^*B \rightarrow T', f^*h : f^*B \rightarrow X)$ is twistable (resp. very twistable) iff $f(T') \subset U_{t\text{-able}}$ (resp. $f(T') \subset U_{vt\text{-able}}$).*

Proof. It suffices to check that if $t_0 \in T$ is a geometric point such that $h_{t_0} : B_{t_0} \rightarrow X$ is twistable (resp. very twistable), then there is an étale neighborhood of $t_0 \in T$ over which ξ is twistable (resp. very twistable). Denote by $\zeta_0 : B_{t_0} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ the twisting morphism. We consider $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ as a projective scheme via the Plücker and Segré embeddings of $\mathbb{G}(1, n) \times \mathbb{P}^n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\frac{n(n+1)^2}{2}-1}$. Let β denote the degree of the stable map ζ_0 .

Define $\mathcal{M} = T \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1), \beta)$, i.e. $\mathcal{M}$ parametrizes pairs (t, ζ) where $t \in T$ is a point and where $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is a genus 0 stable map of degree β . Denote the universal stable map by

$$\rho : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1), \beta), \quad (83)$$

$$\zeta : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1). \quad (84)$$

As in notation 4.2, let $p : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be the pullback by ζ of the universal curve over $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$, let $\sigma : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \Sigma$ be the pullback of the universal section, let $g : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ be the pullback of the universal map, and let $h = g \circ \sigma$. So we have a family of prestable maps

$$\tilde{\xi} = (\rho : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1), \beta), h : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow X). \quad (85)$$

By [1, lemma 1] there is a maximal open substack $\mathcal{U}_e \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1), \beta)$ over which $\tilde{\xi}$ is stable of degree e . By assumption, (t_0, ζ_0) is in $T \times \mathcal{U}_e$.

In the last paragraph we constructed a 1-morphism

$$(1_T, \tilde{\xi}) : T \times \mathcal{U}_e \rightarrow T \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e). \quad (86)$$

We also saw that (t_0, ζ_0) is in the domain of this 1-morphism. The claim is that $(1_T, \tilde{\xi})$ is smooth on a neighborhood of (t_0, ζ_0) , i.e. that $\tilde{\xi} : \mathcal{U}_e \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is smooth at ζ_0 . First we will show that $\mathcal{U}_e$ is smooth at ζ_0 . The space of first order deformations and the obstruction space of $\mathcal{U}_e$ at ζ_0 are given by

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{B_{t_0}}^i(L_{\zeta_0}, \mathcal{O}_{B_{t_0}}), \quad (87)$$

for $i = 1, 2$ respectively, where L_{ζ_0} is the complex

$$\begin{array}{ccc} -1 & & 0 \\ \zeta_0^* \Omega_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)} & \xrightarrow{d(\zeta_0)^\dagger} & \Omega_{B_{t_0}}. \end{array} \quad (88)$$

Now the induced morphism $\xi_0 : B_{t_0} \rightarrow X$ by $\xi_0 = \text{ev} \circ \zeta_0$ also has an associated complex $L_{\xi_0}^\bullet$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} -1 & & 0 \\ \xi_0^* \Omega_X & \xrightarrow{d(\xi_0)^\dagger} & \Omega_{B_{t_0}}. \end{array} \quad (89)$$

There is a morphism of complexes:

$$\gamma : L_{\xi_0}^\bullet \rightarrow L_{\zeta_0}^\bullet \quad (90)$$

$$\gamma^0 = \text{id} : \Omega_B \rightarrow \Omega_B \quad (91)$$

$$\gamma^{-1} = \zeta_0^* (d(\text{ev})^\dagger) : \zeta_0^* \text{ev}^* \Omega_X \rightarrow \zeta_0^* \Omega_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X,1)}. \quad (92)$$

There is also a morphism of complexes:

$$\delta : L_{\zeta_0}^\bullet \rightarrow \zeta_0^* \Omega_{\text{ev}}[1], \quad (93)$$

where $\delta^{-1} : \zeta_0^* \Omega_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X,1)} \rightarrow \zeta_0^* \Omega_{\text{ev}}$ is the pullback of the canonical surjection. And the triple:

$$L_{\xi_0}^\bullet \xrightarrow{\gamma} L_{\zeta_0}^\bullet \xrightarrow{\delta} \zeta_0^* \Omega_{\text{ev}}[1] \quad (94)$$

is an exact triangle. Thus there is a corresponding long exact sequence of $\mathbb{E}\text{xt}$'s. Condition (2) of definition 4.3 says that $\mathbb{E}\text{xt}_{B_{t_0}}^1(L_{\xi_0}^\bullet, \mathcal{O}_{B_{t_0}})$ is zero. By condition (4) of the definition, $\zeta_0^* T_{\text{ev}}$ is generated by global sections. Since B_{t_0} is connected of arithmetic genus 0, we have that $H^1(B_{t_0}, \mathcal{O}_{B_{t_0}})$ is zero. So for any trivial bundle, H^1 is zero. Since H^2 vanishes on all coherent sheaves, we conclude that for any sheaf generated by global sections, H^1 is zero. Thus we have that the group

$$\mathbb{E}\text{xt}^2(\zeta_0^* \Omega_{\text{ev}}, \mathcal{O}_{B_{t_0}}) = H^1(B_{t_0}, T_{\text{ev}}), \quad (95)$$

is also zero. By the long exact sequence, we conclude that $\mathbb{E}\text{xt}_{B_{t_0}}^1(L_{\zeta_0}^\bullet, \mathcal{O}_{B_{t_0}})$ is also zero. So the obstruction group vanishes and $\mathcal{U}_e$ is smooth at ζ_0 .

By condition (2) the image point $\xi_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is a smooth point of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$. Thus to prove that $\tilde{\xi} : \mathcal{U}_e \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is smooth, it suffices to prove that derivative map $d(\tilde{\xi})$ is surjective on the space of first order deformations. The map

$$d(\tilde{\xi}) : \mathbb{E}\text{xt}_{B_{t_0}}^1(L_{\zeta_0}^\bullet, \mathcal{O}_{B_{t_0}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}\text{xt}_{B_{t_0}}^1(L_{\xi_0}^\bullet, \mathcal{O}_{B_{t_0}}), \quad (96)$$

is precisely the map occurring in the long exact sequence of $\mathbb{E}\text{xt}$'s from the paragraph above. By the long exact sequence, the cokernel of this map is a subgroup of $H^1(B_{t_0}, T_{\text{ev}})$, and this is zero as we have seen. Therefore $\tilde{\xi}$ is smooth at $\zeta_0 \in \mathcal{U}_e$.

Consider the morphism $(1_T, \xi) : T \rightarrow T \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$. We can form the fiber product $\mathcal{M}$ of $(1_T, \xi)$ with the morphism $(1_T, \tilde{\xi}) : T \times \mathcal{U}_e \rightarrow T \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$. The fiber product $\mathcal{M}$ exactly parametrizes triples (t, ζ, θ) where $t \in T$ is a point, $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is a point in $\mathcal{U}_e$, and $\theta : \xi_t \rightarrow \tilde{\zeta}$ is an equivalence of objects in the groupoid $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)(\text{Spec } \kappa(t))$. The projection map $\text{pr}_1 : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow T$ is smooth at (t_0, ζ_0) by the last paragraph. So we can find an étale morphism $f : M \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ of a scheme to $\mathcal{M}$ whose image contains (t_0, ζ_0) , and such that $M \rightarrow T$ is smooth. Thus there is an étale morphism $u : T' \rightarrow T$ and a section $z : T' \rightarrow M$. Define $\zeta : T' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_e$ to be the composition $\text{pr}_2 \circ g \circ z$.

We also denote by $\zeta : B' \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ the pullback by $\zeta : T' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ of the universal stable map. As $\tilde{\xi}(\zeta) : B' \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is equivalent to $u^*\xi : u^*B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$, after replacing T' by an étale cover, we may suppose that $B' = u^*B$ as T' -schemes, and $\tilde{\xi}(\zeta) = u^*\xi$. Now the fiber of $\zeta : u^*B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ over any preimage of (t_0, ζ_0) is twisting. So by lemma 4.7, up to replacing T' by a Zariski open subscheme, we may suppose that $\zeta : u^*B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is twisting. Similarly, if (t_0, ζ_0) is very twisting, we may suppose that ζ is very twisting. So we conclude that on the Zariski open subscheme of T which is the image of $u : T' \rightarrow T$, the family $\xi : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is twistable (resp. very twistable). Since this holds for every point $t_0 \in T$ where ξ_0 is twistable, the lemma is proved. $\square$

Lemma 4.10. *Suppose given two families*

$$\xi_i = ((\pi_i : B_i \rightarrow T, \sigma_i : T \rightarrow B_i), h_i : B_i \rightarrow X), i = 1, 2. \quad (97)$$

such that for each $(\pi_i : B_i \rightarrow T, h_i : B_i \rightarrow X)$ is twistable, and such that $h_1 \circ \sigma_1 = h_2 \circ \sigma_2$. For each $t \in T$, assume that the locus of free lines in X passing through $h_1 \circ \sigma_1(t) = h_2 \circ \sigma_2(t)$ is irreducible.

Let us denote by

$$\xi = (\pi : B \rightarrow T, h : B \rightarrow X) \quad (98)$$

the family obtained by taking B to be the connected sum of B_1 and B_2 where the section σ_1 is identified with the section σ_2 . Then ξ is a twistable family. Moreover, if at least one of ξ_1, ξ_2 is very twistable, then ξ is very twistable.

Proof. This follows essentially by lemma 4.6. First of all, using proposition 4.9, it suffices to prove the result when $T = \text{Spec } k$ for some algebraically closed field k . We suppose that we are in this case.

For each of $i = 1, 2$, let $\mathcal{M}_i$ denote the fiber product constructed in the proof of proposition 4.9, i.e. $\mathcal{M}_i$ parametrizes pairs (ζ_i, θ_i) where $\zeta_i : B_i \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is a twisting family (resp. very twisting family) such that the induced map

$$\tilde{\zeta}_i = ((B_i, \sigma_i), g_i \circ \rho_i : B_i \rightarrow X) \quad (99)$$

is stable, and where $\theta_i : \xi_i \rightarrow \tilde{\zeta}_i$ is an equivalence of objects. Since each of ξ_i is twistable, we see that each of $\mathcal{M}_i$ is nonempty.

By the proof of proposition 4.9, each of $\mathcal{M}_i$ is smooth. By the definition of twisting families, for each $i = 1, 2$ the morphism

$$e_i : \mathcal{M}_i \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1), \zeta_i \mapsto \zeta_i(\sigma_i) \quad (100)$$

has image contained in the unobstructed locus of $\text{ev} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1) \rightarrow X$. Let $P \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ be the preimage under ev of the point $p = h_1(\sigma_1) = h_2(\sigma_2)$. The image of e_i is contained in the smooth locus of P . The claim is that $e_i : \mathcal{M}_i \rightarrow P$ is smooth. By [10, proposition I.2.14.2], the obstruction space at a point ζ_i is contained in the cohomology group $H^1(B_i, \zeta_i^* T_{\text{ev}}(-\sigma_i))$. By the definition of a twisting family, $\zeta_i^* T_{\text{ev}}$ is generated by global sections. Thus, by lemma 2.1, the cohomology group above is zero. Since the obstruction space vanishes, we conclude that e_i is smooth.

Since both $e_1 : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow P$ and $e_2 : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow P$ are smooth, both have nonempty, open image. And P is irreducible by assumption. Therefore the image of e_1 and the image of e_2 intersect. If we choose a family $\zeta_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$ and $\zeta_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2$ such that $e_1(\zeta_1) = e_2(\zeta_2)$, then we can glue ζ_1 and ζ_2 to obtain a morphism $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ such that $\zeta|_{B_1} = \zeta_1$ and $\zeta|_{B_2} = \zeta_2$. By lemma 4.6, we conclude that ζ is twisting. Moreover, if at least one of $\zeta_i, i = 1, 2$ is very twisting, then ζ is very twisting. And $\tilde{\zeta} = \xi$. This shows that ξ is twistable, and it is very twistable if at least one of $\xi_i, i = 1, 2$ is very twistable. $\square$

Hypothesis 4.11. Let $U \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ denote the preimage of $U_{\text{t-able}} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, 1)$ under pr . The evaluation morphism $\text{ev} : U \rightarrow X$ has Zariski dense image.

Definition 4.12. Suppose $\pi : B \rightarrow T$ is a family of prestable, geometrically connected curves of arithmetic genus 0. A 1-morphism $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$ is *positive* (resp. *very positive*) if:

1. The data $(\pi : B \rightarrow T, h : B \rightarrow X)$ is a family of stable maps to X , i.e. a 1-morphism $\xi : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon \geq 0$.
2. The image of $\xi : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, \epsilon)$ is contained in the *very unobstructed* locus of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, \epsilon)$.
3. The image of $\text{pr} \circ \zeta : T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is contained in the *very unobstructed* locus of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$.
4. The pullback bundle $(\text{pr} \circ \zeta)^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)}$ is π -relatively deformation ample.
5. The pullback line bundle $\sigma^* \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ is π -relatively generated by global sections (resp. π -relatively ample).

Remark 4.13. Regarding the definition above:

1. This definition is very similar to definition 4.3. It differs in that e need not equal 1 and that we only require $\text{pr} \circ \zeta$ to have image in the very unobstructed locus, instead of requiring ζ to have image in the very unobstructed locus of ev .
2. Consider the case when $T = \text{Spec } \kappa$ for some field κ , and suppose that B is smooth, i.e. $B \cong \mathbb{P}_\kappa^1$. If $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$ is positive, then the morphism $\text{pr} \circ \zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is *very free* in the sense of Debarre [4, p. 86].

Lemma 4.14. Let $\pi : B \rightarrow T$ be a family of prestable, geometrically connected curves of arithmetic genus 0 and let $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ be a 1-morphism. There is an open subscheme $U_{\text{pos}} \subset T$ (resp. $U_{v\text{-pos}} \subset T$) with the following property: for any morphism of schemes $f : T' \rightarrow T$, the pullback family $f^* \pi : f^* B \rightarrow T'$ and $f^* \zeta : f^* B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is positive (resp. very positive) iff $f(T') \subset U_{\text{free}}$ (resp. $f(T') \subset U_{v\text{-free}}$).

Proof. The proof is almost identical to the proof of lemma 4.7. $\square$

Lemma 4.15. Suppose that $T = \text{Spec } k$ is a point and $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$ is a positive 1-morphism whose image is contained in the locus of very stable maps.

1. If B is smooth, then $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$ is free in the sense of Kollár [10, definition II.3.11]. If ζ is very positive, then ζ is very free.

2. In any case, the 1-morphism is unobstructed in the sense of Kollár [10, definition I.2.6]; in particular it is the specialization of a positive 1-morphism $\zeta_\eta : B_\eta \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$ with B_η geometrically connected and smooth, and whose image is contained in the locus of very stable maps.

Proof. Suppose that the image of ζ lies in the locus of very stable maps. By the relative version of lemma 3.9, we have that the image of ζ is in the smooth locus of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$. And we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \sigma^* \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma) \longrightarrow \zeta^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)} \longrightarrow (\text{pr} \circ \zeta)^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (101)$$

By condition (4) of definition 4.12, $(\text{pr} \circ \zeta)^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)}$ is deformation ample. And by condition (5) of definition 4.12, $\sigma^* \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ is generated by global sections (resp. deformation ample). Therefore $\zeta^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)}$ is generated by global sections. And if ζ is very positive, then $\zeta^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)}$ is deformation ample by (2) of lemma 2.8. So if B is smooth, then ζ is free, and it is very free if ζ is very positive. This proves (1).

Since $\zeta^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)}$ is generated by global sections, by lemma 2.1, $H^1(B, \zeta^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)})$ is zero. Therefore ζ is unobstructed in the sense of Kollár. Now let $\pi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ be a smoothing of B , i.e. a flat family of proper, geometrically connected, prestable curves of arithmetic genus 0 over a DVR such that the special fiber is isomorphic to B and such that the general fiber B_η is smooth. By [10, theorem I.2.10], the projection of the relative Hom-scheme,

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Spec } R}(\mathcal{B}, \text{Spec } R \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)) \rightarrow \text{Spec } R, \quad (102)$$

is smooth at $[\zeta]$. Therefore, after making some finite, flat base change $\text{Spec } R' \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ we may suppose that ζ is the specialization of a 1-morphism $\zeta_R : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$. By lemma 4.14, we have that ζ_R is positive, in particular $\zeta_\eta : B_\eta \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$ is positive. Since the locus of very stable maps in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$ is open, we conclude that the image of ζ_R is contained in this locus. $\square$

Now we come to the main notion of this section.

Definition 4.16. Suppose $\pi : B \rightarrow T$ is a family of prestable, geometrically connected curves of arithmetic genus 0. An *inducting pair* of degree e is a pair

$$(\zeta_1 : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1), \overline{\zeta}_e : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)), \quad (103)$$

such that:

1. ζ_1 is very twisting,
2. $\overline{\zeta}_e$ is very positive and the image of $\overline{\zeta}_e$ is contained in the locus of very stable maps, and
3. the two morphisms $h_{\zeta_1} : B \rightarrow X$ and $h_{\overline{\zeta}_e} : B \rightarrow X$ are equal.

Lemma 4.17. Let $\pi : B \rightarrow T$ be a family of prestable, geometrically connected curves of arithmetic genus 0, and let

$$(\zeta_1 : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1), \overline{\zeta}_e : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)), \quad (104)$$

be a pair of 1-morphisms such that $h_{\zeta_1} = h_{\overline{\zeta}_e}$. Then there is an open subscheme $U_{\text{induct}} \subset T$ with the following property: for any morphism of schemes $f : T' \rightarrow T$, the pullback of $(\zeta_1, \overline{\zeta}_e)$ is inducting iff $f(T') \subset U$.

Proof. We just define U_{induct} to be the intersection of the open subset $U_{\text{vtwist}} \subset T$ as in lemma 4.7 for ζ_1 and the open subset $U_{\text{v-pos}} \subset T$ as in lemma 4.14 for $\bar{\zeta}_e$. $\square$

We finally come to our last definition.

Definition 4.18. Suppose $(\pi : B \rightarrow T, \bar{\zeta}_e : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e))$ is a very positive family whose image is contained in the locus of very stable maps. We say $\bar{\zeta}_e$ is *inductable* if there is a surjective étale morphism $u : T' \rightarrow T$ and a morphism $\zeta_1 : u^*B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ with $h_{\zeta_1} = u^*h_{\bar{\zeta}_e}$ such that $(\zeta_1, \bar{\zeta}_e)$ is an inducing pair.

Lemma 4.19. Let $(\pi : B \rightarrow T, \bar{\zeta}_e : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e))$ be a very free family. There is an open subscheme $U_{i\text{-able}} \subset T$ such that for each morphism of schemes $f : T' \rightarrow T$, the pullback $(f^*\pi : f^*B \rightarrow T', f^*\bar{\zeta}_e : f^*B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e))$ is inductable iff $f(T') \subset U_{i\text{-able}}$.

Proof. We simply apply proposition 4.9 to

$$\xi := (\pi : B \rightarrow T, h_{\bar{\zeta}_e} : B \rightarrow X). \quad (105)$$

$\square$

5. THE INDUCTION ARGUMENT

In this section we will show that given an inductable 1-morphism $\bar{\zeta}_e : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$, this gives rise to an inductable 1-morphism $\bar{\zeta}_{e+1} : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$. The basic idea is, given an inducing pair $(\zeta_1, \bar{\zeta}_{e+1})$ to form the family of connected sums. This isn't quite an inductable 1-morphism, but after deforming and then performing a simple operation which we call a *modification*, we do obtain an inductable 1-morphism $\bar{\zeta}_{e+1}$.

Notation 5.1. We will follow [11] in our notation of the tautological divisors on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(\mathbb{P}^N, e)$. Specifically, in $A^1(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(\mathbb{P}^N, e))_{\mathbb{Q}}$ we denote by $\Delta_{(e_1, e_2)}$ the $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor whose general point parametrizes a reducible embedded curve with one irreducible component of degree e_1 , one irreducible component of degree e_2 and where the marked point is on the first irreducible component. We denote by $\mathcal{L}$ the divisor class $\text{ev}^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(1)$. And we denote by $\mathcal{H}$ the divisor which parametrizes stable maps whose image in $\mathbb{P}^r$ intersects a given codimension 2 linear space. Given a closed subscheme $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$, we also denote by $\Delta_{(e_1, e_2)}$, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ the pullbacks of the divisors given above by the induced 1-morphism $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(\mathbb{P}^N, e)$.

Before proceeding to the main result of this section, we describe an operation which we will perform repeatedly in the proof. Suppose that $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, e)$ is a family of stable maps as in notation 4.2. Suppose $b \in B$ is a point whose image $\zeta(b)$ is a stable map

$$((\Sigma_b, p_1, \dots, p_r), g_b : \Sigma_b \rightarrow X). \quad (106)$$

Suppose that $L \subset \Sigma_b$ is an irreducible component which is not contracted by g_b and $p_i \in L$ is one of the marked points. For simplicity assume that L contains no nodes, in particular this is the case when L has genus 0. Let $M \subset \Sigma_b$ denote all the irreducible components of Σ_b other than L . Let $R = (r_1, \dots, r_l)$ denote the set of intersection points of L and M with some ordering. Let $D = (p_{j_1}, \dots, p_{j_m})$ denote the set of marked points which lie on L other than p_i and let $E = (p_{k_1}, \dots, p_{k_n})$ denote the set of marked points which lie on M .

Form the product surface $L \times L$ with diagonal $\Delta : L \rightarrow L \times L$ and let $u : \Lambda \rightarrow L$ denote the blowing up of $L \times L$ along the set of points $\Delta(R \cup D)$. For each point $p \in R \cup D$, let $F_p \subset \Lambda$ be the proper transform of $L \times \{p\}$. Let F_{p_i} denote the proper transform of the diagonal $\Delta(L) \subset L \times L$. Consider $\text{pr}_1 \circ u : \Lambda \rightarrow L$ as a family of prestable curves parametrized by L . Then the data

$$\tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda = (\text{pr}_1 \circ u : \Lambda \rightarrow L, (\sigma_{p_i}, \sigma_p | p \in R \cup D)), \quad (107)$$

where $\sigma_p : L \rightarrow F_p$ is the unique isomorphism such that $\text{pr}_1 \circ \sigma_p$ is the identity, gives a family of prestable marked curves parametrizing by L , it is essentially the constant family $L \times (L, \{p_i\} \cup R \cup D) \rightarrow L$ except that we are allowing p_i to vary among all points in L and then blowing up to obtain a stable family.

Next we form the constant family of prestable marked curves parametrized by L :

$$\tilde{\zeta}_{L \times M} = (\text{pr}_1 : L \times M \rightarrow L, (s_p | p \in R \cup E)) \quad (108)$$

where $s_p : L \rightarrow L \times M$ is simply $s_p(t) = (t, p)$. We can glue $\tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_{L \times M}$ as follows. For each $p \in R$, we identify the section σ_p of $\tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda$ with the section s_p of $\tilde{\zeta}_{L \times M}$. Here the identification is the unique one compatible with projection to L . Let us denote the new family of prestable marked curves by

$$(\rho : \Pi \rightarrow L, (\phi_j : L \rightarrow \Pi | j = 1, \dots, r)) \quad (109)$$

where Π is the surface obtained by gluing Λ and $L \times M$ as above, and where

$$\phi_j = \begin{cases} \sigma_{p_j} & , p_j \in L \\ s_{p_j} & , p_j \in M \end{cases} \quad (110)$$

Notice that there is a unique morphism $\text{pr}_2 : \Pi \rightarrow \Sigma_b$ whose restriction to Λ is $\text{pr}_2 \circ u : \Lambda \rightarrow L \subset \Sigma_b$ and whose restriction to $L \times M$ is $\text{pr}_2 : L \times M \rightarrow M \subset \Sigma_b$. We form a family of stable maps parametrized by L ,

$$\tilde{\zeta}_\Pi = ((\rho : \Pi \rightarrow L, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_r), g_b \circ \text{pr}_2 : \Pi \rightarrow X). \quad (111)$$

Notice that the family $\tilde{\zeta}_\Pi$ is stable, and if we remove the section ϕ_i and stabilize, we just get the constant family parametrized by L whose image is the stabilization of $\zeta(b)$ upon removing p_i . Also, the image $\tilde{\zeta}_\Pi(p_i)$ is precisely $\zeta(b)$. Let $\tilde{B}$ be the connected sum of B and L where $b \in B$ is identified with $p_i \in L$. Since $\tilde{\zeta}_\Pi(p_i) = \zeta(b)$, we may form a 1-morphism $\tilde{\zeta} : \tilde{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, e)$ such that $\tilde{\zeta}$ restricted to B is ζ , and $\tilde{\zeta}$ restricted to L is $\tilde{\zeta}_\Pi$.

Notation 5.2. Given a 1-morphism $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, e)$, a point $b \in B$, an irreducible component $L \subset \Sigma_b$, and a marked point $p_i \in L$ as above, we call the 1-morphism $\tilde{\zeta} : \tilde{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}(X, e)$ constructed in the last paragraph the *modification* of ζ determined by $b \in B$, by L and by p_i .

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose given a 1-morphism $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)$, a point $b \in B$, an irreducible component $L \subset \Sigma_b$ which is not contracted, and a marked point $p_i \in L$ such that when we remove p_i , the resulting stable map is a smooth point of*

$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r-1}(X, e)$ (this condition is equivalent to the condition that the image of $\tilde{\zeta}_\Pi$ is contained in the smooth locus of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)$). Then we have the vanishing

$$H^1\left(L, \tilde{\zeta}_\Pi^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)}\right) = 0. \quad (112)$$

In particular, if $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)$ is a free morphism of a rational curve into the smooth locus, then there are deformations of $\tilde{\zeta} : \tilde{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)$ which smooth the node of $\tilde{B}$.

Proof. This is an application of the deformation theory of section 3. Let τ denote the dual graph of $\zeta(b)$ and let $\psi : \tau \rightarrow \tau'$ be the combinatorial morphism of graphs which removes the tail associated to p_i . The morphism $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \psi) : \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau')$ is smooth along the image of $\tilde{\zeta}_\Pi$ and the pullback of the vertical tangent bundle is simply T_L . So $\tilde{\zeta}_\Pi^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)}$ is generated by global sections. The pullback of the normal sheaf $\mathcal{N}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)$ is the direct sum over all $r_j \in R$ of $N_{F_j/\Lambda} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T_{r_j} M$. As the normal bundle of $N_{F_j/\Lambda}$ is just $\mathcal{O}_L(-1)$, we conclude that $H^1(L, \mathcal{N}) = 0$. We have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \tilde{\zeta}_\Pi^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)} \longrightarrow \tilde{\zeta}_\Pi^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (113)$$

In the corresponding long exact sequence of cohomology, H^1 of the first and third terms vanishes. Therefore we have the vanishing result.

Suppose that $\zeta : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)$ is a free 1-morphism of a rational curve into the smooth locus of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)$. Then $\zeta^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)}$ is generated by global sections, so $H^1(B, \zeta^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)}(-b))$ is zero by lemma 2.1. We have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \zeta^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)}(-b) \longrightarrow \tilde{\zeta}^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)} \longrightarrow \tilde{\zeta}_\Pi^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (114)$$

In the corresponding long exact sequence of cohomology, H^1 of the first and third terms vanishes. Therefore $H^1(\tilde{B}, \tilde{\zeta}^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)})$ vanishes. This cohomology group is the obstruction to smoothing the node, therefore there are deformations of $\tilde{\zeta} : \tilde{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)$ which smooth the node of $\tilde{B}$. $\square$

Remark 5.4. In case the line bundle $\sigma^* \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ is generated by global sections and L contains only one node of Σ_b , we have a simpler proof of the deformation result. We have a short exact sequence of sheaves on Σ :

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma + L) \longrightarrow N_{L/\Sigma}(p_i) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (115)$$

Since L contains only one node, $N_{L/\Sigma} \cong \mathcal{O}_L(-1)$, so the last term is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_L$. So $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma + L)$ is generated by global sections. A small deformation σ' of $\sigma + L$ in the linear series $|\sigma + L|$ will be a section of $\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow B$, and the stabilization of the 1-morphism $B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,r}(X, e)$ which removes the section σ from ζ and replaces it by σ' will be a small deformation of $\tilde{\zeta}$ which smooths the node of $\tilde{B}$.

Now we come to the main theorem of this section, which we use for the induction step in the proof of theorem 1.1.

Theorem 5.5. *Suppose that X satisfies hypothesis 1.2, hypothesis 1.3, hypothesis 1.4, and hypothesis 4.11. For each integer $e \geq 1$, if there exists an inductable map $\bar{\zeta}_e : B_e \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$, then there exists an inductable map $\bar{\zeta}_{e+1} : B_{e+1} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$.*

More precisely, suppose that $(\zeta_1, \bar{\zeta}_e)$ is an inducting pair. Let us denote:

$$s = \deg(\zeta_1)^*(2\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{H}), \quad (116)$$

$$\bar{s} = \deg(\bar{\zeta}_e)^*(2\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{H}) \quad (117)$$

Then for each $k = 1, \dots, \bar{s}$, there is an inducting pair $(\xi_1^k, \bar{\xi}_{e+1}^k)$ satisfying the following.

1. We have

$$\deg((\xi_1^k)^*\mathcal{H}) = \deg(\zeta_1^*\mathcal{H}) + 2k. \quad (118)$$

2. We have

$$\deg((\xi_1^k)^*\mathcal{L}) = \deg((\bar{\xi}_{e+1}^k)^*\mathcal{L}) = \deg(\zeta_1^*\mathcal{L}) + k. \quad (119)$$

3. We have

$$\deg((\bar{\xi}_{e+1}^k)^*\mathcal{H}) = \deg(\zeta_1^*\mathcal{H}) + \deg(\bar{\zeta}_e^*\mathcal{H}). \quad (120)$$

4. For each $e_1 + e_2 = e$ with both $e_1, e_2 \geq 2$, we have

$$\deg((\bar{\xi}_{e+1}^k)^*\Delta_{(e_1+1, e_2)}) = \deg(\bar{\zeta}_e^*\Delta_{(e_1, e_2)}). \quad (121)$$

5. If $e > 1$, we have

$$\deg((\bar{\xi}_{e+1}^k)^*\Delta_{(e, 1)}) = \deg(\bar{\zeta}_e^*\Delta_{(e-1, 1)}) + s + k, \quad (122)$$

and we have

$$\deg((\bar{\xi}_{e+1}^k)^*\Delta_{(1, e)}) = \bar{s} - k. \quad (123)$$

6. If $e = 1$, we have

$$\deg((\bar{\xi}_2^k)^*\Delta_{(1, 1)}) = s + \bar{s}. \quad (124)$$

Proof. By lemma 4.15 and lemma 4.19, we may suppose that B_e is smooth. Moreover, in this case $\bar{\zeta}_e : B_e \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$ is free (in fact very free). Therefore, we may suppose that $\bar{\zeta}_e(B_e)$ is in general position: for any finite collection of codimension 2 subvarieties $(Z_\alpha | \alpha = 1, \dots, M)$ and any finite collection of divisors $(D_\beta | \beta = 1, \dots, N)$, we may suppose that $\bar{\zeta}_e(B_e)$ is disjoint from each Z_α and has 0-dimensional intersection with each D_β .

Let us denote the family of stable maps $\bar{\zeta}_e$ by:

$$(\bar{p} : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow B, \bar{\sigma} : B \rightarrow \bar{\Sigma}, \bar{g} : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow X). \quad (125)$$

And let us denote the family of stable maps ζ_1 by

$$(p : \Sigma \rightarrow B, \sigma : B \rightarrow \Sigma, g : \Sigma \rightarrow X). \quad (126)$$

The basic idea is to form the connected sum of the surfaces Σ and $\bar{\Sigma}$ glued along the sections σ and $\bar{\sigma}$. The actual family $\bar{\zeta}_{e+1}$ is a bit more complicated.

Define $\pi' : \Sigma' \rightarrow B$ to be the family of curves obtained by taking the connected sum of Σ and $\bar{\Sigma}$ glued along the sections σ and $\bar{\sigma}$. Here π' is the unique morphism such that $\pi'|_{\Sigma} = \pi$ and $\pi'|_{\bar{\Sigma}} = \bar{\pi}$. Define $g' : \Sigma' \rightarrow X$ to be the unique morphism such that $g'|_{\Sigma} = g$ and $g'|_{\bar{\Sigma}} = \bar{g}$. Then $\zeta' = (\pi' : \Sigma' \rightarrow B, g' : \Sigma' \rightarrow X)$ is a family of stable maps in the boundary divisor $\Delta_{e,1}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e+1)$. Moreover, ζ' clearly factors through the Behrend-Manin stack $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow X$ where τ is the genus 0 stable A -graph with two vertices v_1, v_2 with $\beta(v_1) = 1$ and $\beta(v_2) = e$. By lemma 3.11, we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \zeta_1^* T_{\text{ev}} \longrightarrow (\zeta')^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)} \longrightarrow \bar{\zeta}_e^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (127)$$

Since ζ_1 is very twisting, by definition 4.4 we have that $\zeta_1^* T_{\text{ev}}$ is ample. Since $\bar{\zeta}_e$ is very positive, by lemma 4.15, we have that $\bar{\zeta}_e^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)}$ is ample. Therefore $(\zeta')^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)}$ is ample. By lemma 3.12, we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow (\zeta')^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)} \rightarrow (\zeta')^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e+1)} \rightarrow \sigma^* \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\sigma) \otimes \bar{\sigma}^* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{\Sigma}}(\bar{\sigma}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (128)$$

By definition 4.4 and definition 4.12, we have that both $\sigma^* \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\sigma)$ and $\bar{\sigma}^* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{\Sigma}}(\bar{\sigma})$ are ample. Therefore their tensor product is ample, and we conclude that $(\zeta')^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e+1)}$ is ample.

Denote by $\bar{s}$ the self-intersection of $\bar{\sigma} \subset \bar{\Sigma}$, i.e. the degree of the invertible sheaf $\bar{\sigma}^* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{\Sigma}}(\bar{\sigma})$. Notice that we have

$$\bar{s} = \deg \left(2\bar{\zeta}_e^* \mathcal{L} - \bar{\zeta}_e^* \mathcal{H} \right). \quad (129)$$

Let $\sigma' : B \rightarrow \bar{\Sigma}$ be a general member of the linear series of $|\bar{\sigma}|$. Since $\bar{\sigma}^* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{\Sigma}}(\bar{\sigma})$ is generated by global sections, we can find such a σ' which has transverse intersections with $\bar{\sigma}$ at points $p_1, \dots, p_{\bar{s}} \in \bar{\Sigma}$. Define $b : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \bar{\Sigma}$ to be the blowing up of $\bar{\Sigma}$ at the points $p_1, \dots, p_{\bar{s}}$. Let $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \bar{\Sigma}$ denote the projection $\tilde{\pi} \circ b$. Let $\tilde{g}$ denote $\bar{g} \circ b$. Let $\tilde{\sigma} : B \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}' : B \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}$ denote the proper transforms of $\bar{\sigma}$ and σ' respectively. Notice that $\tilde{\sigma}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}'$ are disjoint sections. So the data

$$\left((\tilde{p} : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow B, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\sigma}'), \tilde{f} : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow X \right) \quad (130)$$

is a family of stable pointed maps, i.e. a 1-morphism $\tilde{\zeta}_e : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,2}(X, e)$. By the deformation theory in subsection 3.1, we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow (\tilde{\sigma})^* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}(\tilde{\sigma}) \longrightarrow \left(\tilde{\zeta}_e \right)^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,2}(X, e)} \longrightarrow \left(\bar{\zeta} \right)_e^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (131)$$

Of course we have that $(\tilde{\sigma})^* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}(\tilde{\sigma})$ is the trivial invertible sheaf $\mathcal{O}_B$. In particular, we have that $\left(\tilde{\zeta}_e \right)^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,2}(X, e)}$ is generated by global sections.

Define $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow B$ to be the family of curves obtained by taking the connected sum of Σ and $\tilde{\Sigma}$ glued along the sections σ and τ respectively. Here $\tilde{\pi}$ is the unique morphism such that $\tilde{\pi}|_{\tilde{\Sigma}} = \tilde{\pi}$ and $\tilde{\pi}|_{\Sigma} = \pi$. Define $\tilde{g} : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow X$ to be the unique morphism such that $\tilde{g}|_{\tilde{\Sigma}} = \tilde{g}$ and such that $\tilde{g}|_{\Sigma} = g$. Define $\tilde{\sigma} : B \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}$ to be the

section from the last paragraph. This gives a family of stable maps:

$$\tilde{\zeta} = \left((\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow B, \tilde{\sigma} : B \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}), \tilde{g} : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow X \right). \quad (132)$$

Define τ to be the unique genus 0 stable A -graph with two vertices v_1, v_2 , with one edge joining v_1 and v_2 , with one flag attached to v_1 , with $\beta(v_1) = e$, and with $\beta(v_2) = 1$. In other words, τ is the dual graph of a stable map with one marked point, with reducible domain consisting of two irreducible components, where the component with the marked point has degree e and where the other component has degree 1. Then $\tilde{\zeta} : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$ is a 1-morphism which factors through the Behrend-Manin stack $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$. By lemma 3.11, we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \zeta_1^* T_{\text{ev}} \longrightarrow (\tilde{\zeta})^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)} \longrightarrow (\tilde{\zeta}_e)^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,2}(X, e)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (133)$$

As the first and third term in this exact sequence are generated by global sections, also $(\tilde{\zeta})^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)}$ is generated by global sections. Finally, by lemma 3.12 we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow (\tilde{\zeta})^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)} \rightarrow (\tilde{\zeta})^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)} \rightarrow \sigma^* \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\sigma) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} (\tilde{\sigma})^* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}(\tilde{\sigma}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (134)$$

Of course $(\tilde{\sigma})^* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}(\tilde{\sigma})$ is the trivial invertible sheaf. And $\sigma^* \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\sigma)$ is just $\mathcal{O}_B(s)$. Thus the last term in the sequence is an ample invertible sheaf. In particular, $(\tilde{\zeta})^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)}$ is generated by global sections. So the 1-morphism $\tilde{\zeta} : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$ is free. Also, the pullback by $\tilde{\zeta}$ of the normal sheaf of the unramified 1-morphism, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$ is the last term in the sequence, and so has positive degree.

One final remark, when $e > 1$, the image of $\tilde{\zeta}$ intersects the divisor $\Delta_{1,e}$ transversely precisely at the images of the points $p_1, \dots, p_{\overline{s}} \in B$, in particular the degree of the $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier divisor class $\tilde{\sigma}^* \mathcal{O}_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)}(\Delta_{1,e})$ is positive. In the special case $e = 1$, we have that $\Delta_{1,e} = \Delta_{e,1} = \Delta_{1,1}$. In this case $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau)$ is the normalization of $\Delta_{1,1}$ (at least in a neighborhood of the image of $\tilde{\sigma}$). So the degree of $\tilde{\sigma}^* \mathcal{O}_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)}(\Delta_{1,1})$ is the sum of the degree of the pullback of the normal sheaf of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \tau) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$ and the divisor $p_1 + \dots + p_{\overline{s}}$, i.e. $s + \overline{s}$. So in this case, the degree is again positive.

Since $\tilde{\zeta} : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$ is free we can find deformations of $\tilde{\zeta}$ which are in general position. Now by hypothesis 1.2, the locus parametrizing stable maps with at least three irreducible components in their domain has codimension 2. By hypothesis 1.4 the locus parametrizing stable maps with automorphisms has codimension at least 2. Therefore we can find a deformation $\tilde{\zeta}_{e+1}^0 : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$ of $\tilde{\zeta}$ such that the image of $\tilde{\zeta}_{e+1}^0 : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$ misses the locus parametrizing stable maps with at least three irreducible components in their domain and misses the locus parametrizing stable maps with automorphisms. As well, we can assume that the pullback of $T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e+1)}$ by $\text{pr} \circ \tilde{\zeta}_{e+1}^0 : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e+1)$ is an ample vector bundle since the pullback of $T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e+1)}$ by $\text{pr} \circ \tilde{\zeta}$, i.e. by

$\zeta' : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e+1)$, is an ample bundle. Let us denote $\overline{\xi}_{e+1}^0$ by

$$\overline{\xi}_{e+1}^0 = ((\varpi^0 : \Xi^0 \rightarrow B, \lambda^0 : B \rightarrow \Xi^0), g^0 : \Xi^0 \rightarrow B). \quad (135)$$

Define $h^0 : B \rightarrow X$ to be $g^0 \circ \lambda^0$. By assumption, $\overline{h} : B \rightarrow X$ is very twistable, and $h^0 : B \rightarrow X$ is a small deformation of $\overline{h}$. So by proposition 4.9, h^0 is very twistable.

Since $\tilde{\sigma}^* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}(\tilde{\sigma})$ is trivial, we may also assume that $(\lambda^0)^* \mathcal{O}_{\Xi^0}(\lambda^0)$ is trivial. Finally, we may assume that all intersections of the image of $\overline{\xi}_{e+1}^0$ and the divisor $\Delta_{1,e}$ are transverse and occur at general points of $\Delta_{1,e}$. In particular, if $b \in B$ is such a point, we may assume that the corresponding stable map $\overline{\xi}_{e+1}^0(b)$ is of the form $((\Xi_b^0, \lambda_b^0), h_b^0 : \Xi_b^0 \rightarrow X)$ where Ξ_b^0 is a reducible curve $L \cup M$, with $L \cap M$ consisting of one node of Ξ_b^0 which is a general point of X , with $\lambda_q^0 \in L$, and such that $L \rightarrow X$ is an embedding of a line which is twistable.

Now we define $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^0$ to be the modification of $\overline{\xi}_{e+1}^0$ associated to the point $b \in B$, to $L \subset \Xi_b^0$ and $\lambda_q^0 \in L$ (c.f. notation 5.2). We saw above that $h^0 : B \rightarrow X$ is very twistable. And the evaluation map $\tilde{h}_L : L \rightarrow X$ associated to the restriction $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^0 : L \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$ is just the embedding $L \subset X$, which is twistable. By hypothesis 1.3 and the assumption that $L \cap M$ is a general point of X , we see that the hypotheses of lemma 4.10 are satisfied. So by lemma 4.10 we have that the evaluation map $\tilde{h} : \tilde{B} \rightarrow X$ associated to $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^0$ is also very twistable. Also, notice that the image of $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^0$ is contained in the locus of very stable maps.

The 1-morphism $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^0$ satisfies the criterion of lemma 5.3, in fact the criterion of remark 5.4, thus we can smooth the node of $\tilde{B}$. Let $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^1 : B \rightarrow$ denote a small deformation which smooths the node of $\tilde{B}$. We will denote this by

$$\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^1 = ((\pi^1 : \Xi^1 \rightarrow B, \sigma^1 : B \rightarrow \Xi^1), g^1 : \Xi^1 \rightarrow X). \quad (136)$$

The claim is that $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^1$ is inductable. Denote $h^1 = g^1 \circ \sigma^1$. Since $\tilde{h}$ is very twistable and since h^1 is a small deformation of $\tilde{h}$, it follows by proposition 4.9 that h^1 is very twistable. Now the image of $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^0$ is not contained in the locus of very stable maps, precisely because of the point $r \in L$ where $L \cap M = \{r\}$: the stable map $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^0(r)$ is not very stable. But from the description of the smoothing of $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^0$ given in remark 5.4, we can find small deformations whose image is contained in the very stable locus. So we may assume the image of $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^1$ is contained in the locus of very stable maps. It remains only to show that $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^1$ is positive.

That $h^1 : B \rightarrow X$ is a stable map follows from the fact that B is smooth and h^1 is non-constant: in fact the degree of $h^1(B)$ equals the degree of $\tilde{h}(\tilde{B})$, which is just $\deg(h(B)) + 1$. This proves (1) of definition 4.12. To show that $h^1 : B \rightarrow X$ is unobstructed, it suffices to prove that $\tilde{h} : \tilde{B} \rightarrow X$ is unobstructed. By assumption, $h^0 : B \rightarrow X$ is unobstructed (being a small deformation of $h : B \rightarrow X$). And the restriction to L of T_X is generated by global sections (since L is general). Thus

$\tilde{h} : \tilde{B} \rightarrow X$ is unobstructed. This proves (2) of definition 4.12. The map

$$\text{pr} \circ \tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^0 : \tilde{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e) \quad (137)$$

is constant on $L \subset \tilde{B}$, and on $B \subset \tilde{B}$, it is just ζ' . Thus the image is contained in the unobstructed locus. So we have (3) of definition 4.12. The pullback of $T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X,e)}$ to $\tilde{B}$ is trivial on L and equals $(\zeta')^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X,e)}$ on B . Since $(\zeta')^* T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X,e)}$ is ample, we conclude from lemma 2.9 that the pullback to $\tilde{B}$ of $T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X,e)}$ is deformation ample. Since $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^1$ is a small deformation of $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^0$, the pullback of $T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X,e)}$ via $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^1$ is deformation ample by lemma 2.7. This proves (4) of definition 4.12. Now for $\tilde{\zeta}_{e+1}^0$, the pullback of $\tilde{\sigma}^* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}(\sigma)$ is trivial when restricted to $B \subset \tilde{B}$, but on $L \subset \tilde{B}$ it is $\mathcal{O}_L(1)$. So by lemma 2.9, it is deformation ample. Since $\tilde{\zeta}_{e+1}^1$ is a small deformation of $\tilde{\zeta}_{e+1}^0$, by lemma 2.7 we have that $(\sigma^1)^* \mathcal{O}_{\Xi^1}(\sigma^1)$ is deformation ample. So $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^1$ is positive. Therefore it is inductable.

To define the 1-morphisms $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^k : B \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1)$ we repeat the procedure above. Given $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^k$ and a point $b \in B$ whose image is a general point of $\Delta_{(1,e)}$, say $(\Xi_b^k, \lambda_b^k, g_b^k : \Xi_b^k \rightarrow X)$ with $\Xi_b^k = L \cup M$, $\lambda_b^k \in L$ and $g_b^k : L \rightarrow X$ an embedding of a twistable line, we define $\tilde{B}^k$ to be the connected sum of B and L with $b \in B$ identified with $\lambda_b^k \in L$. Then we define

$$\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^k : \tilde{B}^k \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e+1) \quad (138)$$

to be the modification of $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^k$ associated to $b \in B$, $L \subset \Xi_b^k$ and $\lambda_b^k \in L$. By the same argument as above, deformations of $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^k$ smooth the node of $\tilde{B}^k$, and a small deformation $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^{k+1}$ of $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^k$ is inductable.

It is quite simple to work out the degrees of the pullbacks by $\tilde{\xi}_{e+1}^0$ of the tautological divisors of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(\mathbb{P}^n, e+1)$ in terms of the degrees of the pullbacks by ζ_1 and ζ_e of the tautological divisors. This is left to the interested reader. $\square$

6. TWISTABLE LINES

In this section, we will prove that if $n+1 \geq d^2$, then for a general hypersurface $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of degree d and a general line $L \subset X$, we have that L is a twistable line on X . To prove this we introduce some incidence correspondences. Let $N_d = \binom{n+d}{n} - 1$ and let $\mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ denote the projective space parametrizing hypersurfaces $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of degree d . Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^{N_d} \times \mathbb{P}^n$ denote the universal family of degree d hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{P}^n$. Let $\mathbb{G}(1, n)$ denote the Grassmannian variety of lines in $\mathbb{P}^n$. Let $F(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathbb{P}^{N_d} \times \mathbb{G}(1, n)$ denote the parameter space of pairs $([X], [L])$ where $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a hypersurface of degree d , $L \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a line and $L \subset X$. Observe that the projection $F(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{G}(1, d)$ is a projective bundle of relative dimension $N_d - (d+1)$.

Let $P(t) = (t+1)^2$ denote the Hilbert polynomial of a quadric surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$, and let $U \subset \text{Hilb}^{P(t)}(\mathbb{P}^n)$ denote the open subscheme parametrizing subschemes $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$

which are projectively equivalent to a smooth, quadric surface in $\mathbb{P}^3 \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. Let $V \subset U \times \mathbb{G}(1, n)$ denote the parameter space of pairs $([\Sigma], [L])$ where $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a smooth quadric surface, where $L \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a line, and where $L \subset \Sigma$. The projection map $V \rightarrow U$ has a Stein factorization $V \rightarrow \tilde{U} \rightarrow U$ where $\tilde{U} \rightarrow U$ is a finite, étale double cover, and where $V \rightarrow \tilde{U}$ is a $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle. Let $W \subset \mathbb{P}^{N_d} \times U \times \mathbb{G}(1, n)$ denote the parameter space of triples $([X], [\Sigma], [L])$ where $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a hypersurface of degree d , $([\Sigma], [L])$ is a point of V and where $\Sigma \subset X$. The projection map $W \rightarrow V$ is a projective bundle of relative dimension $N_d - (d+1)^2$.

Now for a triple $([X], [\Sigma], [L]) \in W$, there is a map (well-defined up to nonzero scalar) $d_X : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(d-1))$ which evaluates the partial derivatives of a defining equation of X . We may compose this map with the restriction map $H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(d)) \rightarrow H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(d-1))$. Let this map be denoted by $d_{X, \Sigma} : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(d-1))$. More precisely, let E be the trivial vector bundle on W of rank $n+1$, let G be the vector bundle on U whose fiber at a point Σ is just $H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(d-1))$, and let F be the vector bundle on W which is $\text{pr}_1^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{N_d}}(1)) \otimes \text{pr}_2^*G$. Then there is a map of vector bundles $d : E \rightarrow F$ whose fiber over $([X], [\Sigma], [L])$ is the map $d_{X, \Sigma}$ constructed above. Let $W^o \subset W$ denote the open subscheme (possibly empty) over which d is surjective (i.e. the complement of the support of the cokernel of d).

Lemma 6.1. *For any point $([X], [\Sigma], [L]) \in W^o$, we have*

1. X is smooth along Σ ,
2. $H^i(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X})$ is zero for $i > 0$,
3. $H^i(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X}(-L))$ is zero for $i > 0$,
4. $H^i(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1))$ is zero for $i > 0$,
5. $H^1(L, N_{L/X})$ is zero,
6. $H^1(L, N_{L/X}(-1))$ is zero,
7. the projection morphism $W \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ given by $([X], [\Sigma], [L]) \mapsto [X]$ is smooth at $([X], [\Sigma], [L])$,
8. the projection morphism $F(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ given by $([X], [L]) \mapsto [X]$ is smooth at $([X], [L])$, and
9. the projection morphism $\pi : W \rightarrow F(\mathcal{X})$ given by $([X], [\Sigma], [L]) \mapsto ([X], [L])$ is smooth at $([X], [\Sigma], [L])$.

Proof. Since the partial derivatives of a defining equation of X generate $H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(d-1))$, in particular the locus where they all vanish is disjoint from Σ . By the Jacobian criterion, we conclude that X is smooth along Σ .

For a smooth quadric surface $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{P}^3 \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^3} \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n} \longrightarrow N_{\mathbb{P}^3/\mathbb{P}^n}|_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (139)$$

Since $N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^3} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(2)$ and since $N_{\mathbb{P}^3/\mathbb{P}^n}|_{\Sigma} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(1)^{\oplus(n-3)}$, we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(2) \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(1)^{\oplus(n-3)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (140)$$

From this it is easy to compute that $H^i(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n})$, $H^i(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1))$ and $H^i(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-L))$ are all zero for $i > 0$.

There is a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/X} \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n} \longrightarrow N_{X/\mathbb{P}^n}|_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (141)$$

Of course $N_{X/\mathbb{P}^n}|_{\Sigma} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(d)$, and for $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$, for $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-L)$, and for $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1)$, we compute that $H^i(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(d) \otimes \mathcal{L})$ is zero for $i > 0$. The bundle $N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n}$ was computed in the last paragraph. For the line bundles $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-L)$ and $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1)$, we computed that $H^i(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n} \otimes \mathcal{L})$ is zero for $i > 0$. It immediately follows from the long exact sequence in cohomology that $H^2(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X} \otimes \mathcal{L})$ is zero. We also conclude that $H^1(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X} \otimes \mathcal{L})$ is zero iff the corresponding map

$$H^0(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n} \otimes \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow H^0(\Sigma, N_{X/\mathbb{P}^n}|_{\Sigma}) \quad (142)$$

is surjective.

In the case that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1)$, the map from the last paragraph factors the map

$$H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)) \rightarrow H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(d-1)). \quad (143)$$

But this map is precisely the map $d_{X,\Sigma} : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(d-1))$. Since $d_{X,\Sigma}$ is surjective, we conclude that $H^1(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1))$ is zero.

To see that $H^1(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-L))$ is zero, observe that we have $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(1) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(L + L')$ where $L' \subset \Sigma$ is any line in the ruling opposite to the ruling of L . Thus we have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(L')) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n}(-L)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^0(\Sigma, N_{X/\mathbb{P}^n}|_{\Sigma}(-1)) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(L')) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\Sigma, N_{X/\mathbb{P}^n}|_{\Sigma}(-L)) \end{array} \quad (144)$$

The top vertical horizontal arrow is surjective by the last paragraph. Moreover, the right vertical arrow is

$$\begin{aligned} & H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}((d-1)L + (d-1)L')) \otimes H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(L')) \\ & \rightarrow H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}((d-1)L + dL')), \end{aligned} \quad (145)$$

which is clearly surjective. Therefore we conclude that the bottom horizontal arrow is also surjective, i.e. $H^1(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X}(-L))$ is zero. The proof that $H^1(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X})$ is zero is almost identical to the proof that $H^1(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X}(-L))$ is zero and is left to the reader.

To see that $H^1(L, N_{L/X}(-1))$ is zero, first observe we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/X}(-1) \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/X}(-L') \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/X}|_L(-1) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (146)$$

By our computations and the long exact sequence in cohomology, we conclude that $H^1(L, N_{\Sigma/X}|_L(-1))$ is zero. Next observe that we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow N_{L/\Sigma}(-1) \longrightarrow N_{L/X}(-1) \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/X}|_L(-1) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (147)$$

Of course $N_{L/\Sigma} \cong \mathcal{O}_L(1)$, so $H^1(L, N_{L/\Sigma}(-1))$ is zero. And we have seen that $H^1(L, N_{\Sigma/X}|_L(-1))$ is zero. Therefore by the long exact sequence in cohomology, we conclude that $H^1(L, N_{L/X}(-1))$ is zero. By an almost identical argument, we also conclude that $H^1(L, N_{L/X})$ is zero.

Now by [10, proposition I.2.14.2], the obstruction space for the relative Hilbert scheme $\text{Hilb}^{P(t)}(\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^{N_d})$ at a point $([X], [\Sigma])$ is contained in $H^1(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X})$. Since the obstruction space vanishes, it follows by [10, theorem 2.10] that $\text{Hilb}^{P(t)}(\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^{N_d}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ is smooth at $([X], [\Sigma])$. As we have seen $W \rightarrow \text{Hilb}^{P(t)}(\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^{N_d})$ is smooth. Therefore the composition $W \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ is smooth along W^o .

For basically the same reason as above, we conclude that the projection map $F(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ is smooth along the image of $\pi : W^o \rightarrow F(\mathcal{X})$. Since $W^o \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ is smooth, and since $F(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ is smooth along the image of W^o , to prove that π is smooth along W^o , it suffices to check that the derivative map $d\pi : T_{W^o/\mathbb{P}^{N_d}} \rightarrow \pi^* T_{F(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{P}^{N_d}}$ is surjective at every point. This exactly reduces to the statement that $H^0(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X}) \rightarrow H^0(L, N_{\Sigma/X|L})$ is surjective. Since the cokernel is contained in $H^1(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X}(-L))$, which is zero, we conclude the map is surjective. Therefore $\pi : W^o \rightarrow F(\mathcal{X})$ is smooth. $\square$

Now suppose that $([X], [\Sigma], [L])$ is a point in W^o . We associate to this triple a morphism $\zeta : L \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ as follows. Let $\sigma : L \rightarrow \Sigma$ be the inclusion and let $\text{pr}_L : \Sigma \rightarrow L$ be the unique projection such that σ is a section of pr_L . Let $g : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ be the inclusion. Then we have a morphism $\zeta : L \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ given by the data:

$$\zeta = (\text{pr}_L : \Sigma \rightarrow L, \sigma : L \rightarrow \Sigma, g : \Sigma \rightarrow X). \quad (148)$$

Lemma 6.2. *If $([X], [\Sigma], [L])$ is a triple in W^o and if X is smooth, then the corresponding morphism $\zeta : L \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is flexible.*

Proof. We need to check the axioms of definition 4.3. Since $g \circ \sigma : L \rightarrow X$ is an embedding, in particular this map is stable, i.e. axiom (1) is satisfied. By part (5) of lemma 6.1, we conclude that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, 1)$ is unobstructed at $[g \circ \sigma : L \rightarrow X]$, i.e. axiom (2) is satisfied.

To check axiom (3), consider the normal bundle $\mathcal{N}$ of the regular embedding $(\text{pr}_L, g) : \Sigma \rightarrow L \times X$. This fits into a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{pr}_L^* T_L \longrightarrow \mathcal{N} \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/X} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (149)$$

By part (3) of remark 4.5, we need to check that $R^1(\text{pr}_L)_* \mathcal{N}(-\sigma)$ is zero. It is clear that for each fiber L' of $\text{pr}_L : \Sigma \rightarrow L$, we have that $\mathcal{N}(-\sigma)|_{L'}$ is just $N_{L'/X}(-1)$. By part (6) of lemma 6.1, we conclude that $H^1(L', N_{L'/X}(-1))$ is zero. Therefore we conclude that $R^1(\text{pr}_L)_* \mathcal{N}(-\sigma)$ is zero.

By part (3) of remark 4.5, we have that $\zeta^* T_{\text{ev}}$ is equivalent to $(\text{pr}_L)_* \mathcal{N}(-\sigma)$. Twisting the short exact sequence above by $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(-L)$ and applying the long exact sequence of higher direct images, we see that $(\text{pr}_L)_* \mathcal{N}(-\sigma)$ fits between $(\text{pr}_L)_* \text{pr}_L^* T_L(-L)$ and $(\text{pr}_L)_* N_{\Sigma/X}(-L)$ with cokernel $R^1(\text{pr}_L)_* \text{pr}_L^* T_L(-L)$. For any fiber L' of pr_L , we have $T_L(-L)|_{L'}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{L'}(-1)$. Therefore $(\text{pr}_L)_* \text{pr}_L^* T_L(-1)$ and $R^1(\text{pr}_L)_* \text{pr}_L^* T_L(-L)$ are both zero, i.e. $(\text{pr}_L)_* \mathcal{N}(-L)$ is isomorphic to $(\text{pr}_L)_* N_{\Sigma/X}(-L)$.

To show that axiom (4) holds, we want to prove that for any point $p' \in L$ with corresponding fiber $L' = \text{pr}_L^{-1}\{p'\}$, we have that $(\text{pr}_L)_* N_{\Sigma/X}(-L) \otimes \mathcal{O}_L(-p')$ has no H^1 . Observe that since $R^1(\text{pr}_L)_* \text{pr}_L^* T_L(-L-L')$ and $R^1(\text{pr}_L)_* \mathcal{N}(-L-L')$ are

both zero, it follows from the long exact sequence of higher direct images that also $R^1(\mathrm{pr}_L)_* N_{\Sigma/X}(-L-L')$ is zero. Therefore by the Leray spectral sequence, we conclude that $H^1(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X}(-L-L'))$ equals $H^1(L, (\mathrm{pr}_L)_*(N_{\Sigma/X}(-L))(-p'))$. But by part (4) of lemma 6.1, this is zero. Thus axiom (4) is satisfied.

Finally, observe that $\sigma^*\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ is the trivial line bundle, so axiom (5) is satisfied. $\square$

By lemma 6.2, for any pair $([X], [L]) \in F(\mathcal{X})$, if we can find a corresponding triple $([X], [\Sigma], [L]) \in W^o$, then it follows that L is a twistable line on X . Now we come to the main result of this section.

Proposition 6.3. *If $n+1 \geq d^2$ and $d \geq 2$, then $W^o \rightarrow F(\mathcal{X})$ is dominant. Thus for a general pair $([X], [L]) \in F(\mathcal{X})$, we have that L is a twistable line on X .*

Proof. By part (9) of lemma 6.1, it suffices to prove that W^o is nonempty. Let I_d be the set of pairs of integers $I_d = \{(i, j) : 0 \leq i, j \leq d-1, i+j \geq 2\}$. Choose coordinates on $\mathbb{P}^n$ of the form $(Y_0, Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) \cup (X_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in I_d} \cup (Z_m : m = 1, \dots, n+1-d^2)$. Let $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be the smooth quadric surface with ideal

$$I_\Sigma = \langle Y_0Y_3 - Y_1Y_2 \rangle + \langle X_{i,j} | (i, j) \in I_d \rangle + \langle Z_m | m = 1, \dots, n+1-d^2 \rangle. \quad (150)$$

This is the image of the embedding $f : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ given by sending a point $([U_0 : U_1], [V_0 : V_1]) \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ to

$$([U_0 : U_1], [V_0 : V_1]) \mapsto [U_0V_0 : U_0V_1 : U_1V_0 : U_1V_1 : 0 : \dots : 0]. \quad (151)$$

We make the following convention. Given a pair (i, j) of integers, we set $k = \min(i, j)$, we set $i' = i - k$ and we set $j' = j - k$. Consider the hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ with defining equation

$$F = (Y_0Y_3 - Y_1Y_2)Y_3^{d-2} + \sum_{(i,j) \in I_d} Y_0^k Y_1^{i'} Y_2^{j'} Y_3 X_{i,j}. \quad (152)$$

It is clear that $\Sigma \subset X$. We claim that the derivative map $dF : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(d-1))$ is surjective. Observe first that we have

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_0} \mapsto U_1^{d-1} V_1^{d-1}, \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_1} \mapsto U_1^{d-1} V_0 V_1^{d-2}, \quad (153)$$

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_2} \mapsto U_0 U_1^{d-2} V_1^{d-1}, \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_3} \mapsto U_0 U_1^{d-2} V_0 V_1^{d-2}. \quad (154)$$

And observe that for $(i, j) \in I_d$, we have that

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial X_{i,j}} \mapsto U_0^i U_1^{d-1-i} V_0^j V_1^{d-1-j}. \quad (155)$$

Since the partial derivatives of the form $\frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_i}$ give the terms $U_0^i U_1^{d-1-i} V_0^j V_1^{d-1-j}$ with $(i, j) = (0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0)$, and $(1, 1)$, and since these are precisely the pairs (i, j) not contained in I_d , we conclude that dF is surjective. Thus, for any line $L \subset \Sigma$, we have that $([X], [\Sigma], [L])$ is in W^o . $\square$

7. A VERY POSITIVE, VERY TWISTING FAMILY OF LINES

In the last section, we proved that if $n + 1 \geq d^2$, and $d \geq 2$, then for a general hypersurface $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of degree d , a general line $L \subset X$ is twistable, in other words hypothesis 4.11 holds. In this section, we will prove that if $n \geq d^2 + d + 2$, and $d \geq 3$ then there exists a morphism $\bar{\zeta}_1 : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ which is both very twistable and very positive. This provides the base case for the induction argument of section 5.

The arguments in this section are very similar to those of the last section. In that section, the key result was that for $([X], [L])$ general, there is a quadric surface Σ with $L \subset \Sigma \subset X$ such that $H^i(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X}(-1))$ is zero for $i > 0$. This result in turn reduced to finding a single degree d polynomial F on $\mathbb{P}^n$, vanishing on some quadric surface Σ , and such that

$$d_{F,\Sigma} : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(d-1)) \quad (156)$$

is surjective.

In this section, the role of $L \subset X$ will be replaced by a rational normal curve $C_0 \subset X$ of some degree $k \leq n$ (in the end we will only need the case $k = 2d - 3$). The role of the quadric surface will be replaced by a rational normal scroll Σ of degree $2k - 1$ such that $C_0 \subset \Sigma \subset X$. The cohomology vanishing result of the last section will be replaced by the vanishing of $H^i(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X}(-C_0 - 2L))$ for $i > 0$, where L is any line of ruling of Σ . The computation in this section will be to find a single degree d polynomial F on $\mathbb{P}^n$, vanishing on Σ , and such that the image of the map,

$$d_{F,\Sigma} : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(d-1)), \quad (157)$$

let's call it $W \subset H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(d-1))$, has the property that the induced map

$$W \otimes H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma((k-3)L)) \rightarrow H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(d-1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_\Sigma((k-3)L)) \quad (158)$$

is surjective. A similar polynomial F to that of the last section satisfies this condition.

7.1. Generating Linear Systems on $\mathbb{F}_1$. In the last section, the relevant surface was the Hirzebruch surface $\mathbb{F}_0 = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ embedded as a quadric surface. In this section, the relevant surface is the Hirzebruch surface $\mathbb{F}_1$ embedded as a rational normal scroll of degree $2k - 1$. We will perform our computations using the projective model of $\mathbb{F}_1$:

$$\mathbb{F}_1 = \{([T_0 : T_1], [T_0U : T_1U : V]) \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \mid T_0(T_1U) = T_1(T_0U)\}. \quad (159)$$

In the equation above, T_0U and T_1U are simply variables on $\mathbb{P}^2$. We denote the projection maps by $\text{pr}_1 : \mathbb{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\text{pr}_2 : \mathbb{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$. We denote by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1}(F)$ the line bundle $\text{pr}_1^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ and by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1}(E + F)$ the line bundle $\text{pr}_2^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$. Here $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1}(E)$ is the divisor class of the directrix $E \subset \mathbb{F}_1$. This explains our terminology T_0U and T_1U : U is a nonzero element of $H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1}(E))$, and T_0U and T_1U are the products of U with the two global sections T_0 and T_1 of $H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1}(F))$.

We note that the line bundles $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1}(E+F)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1}(F)$ generate the Picard group of $\mathbb{F}_1$. Thus we adopt the terminology for line bundles on $\mathbb{F}_1$:

$$\mathcal{O}(a, b) := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1}(a(E+F) + bF). \quad (160)$$

Note that $E+F$ and F are each NEF, but not ample. We conclude that these two line bundles generate the NEF cone. Thus every NEF line bundle on $\mathbb{F}_1$ is of the form $\mathcal{O}(a, b)$ for some nonnegative integers a, b .

Now suppose that $\mathcal{O}(a, b)$ is some NEF line bundle and $W \subset H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a, b))$ is a linear series.

Definition 7.1. For an integer $c \geq 0$, we say that W is a *c-generating linear system*, if the associated map

$$\mu_{W,c} : W \otimes H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(0, c)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a, b+c)) \quad (161)$$

is surjective.

The question we want to answer is, when is W a *c-generating linear system*. In particular, what is the minimal necessary dimension of a *c-generating linear system*? To simplify the answer, we write $b-1 = \beta_d(c+1) + \beta_r$ where β_d, β_r are integers with $0 \leq \beta_r < c+1$, and we write $a+b-1 = \alpha_d(c+1) + \alpha_r$ where α_d, α_r are integers with $0 \leq \alpha_r < c+1$.

Lemma 7.2. *Define the functions*

$$M(a, b, c) = a^2 + (2b + 3(c+1))a + 2b + 4(c+1) + 2, \quad (162)$$

$$E(a, b, c) = (\beta_r^2 - (c+1)\beta_r) - (\alpha_r^2 - (c-1)\alpha_r) \quad (163)$$

The minimal necessary dimension for a c-generating linear system

$$W \subset H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a, b)) \quad (164)$$

$$\text{is } \dim(W) = \frac{1}{2(c+1)} (M(a, b, c) + E(a, b, c)).$$

Proof. This is just a computation. For any nonnegative integers a', b' there is a decreasing filtration on $H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a', b'))$ given by

$$F^i H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a', b')) = H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a', b')(-iE)). \quad (165)$$

For any linear system $W \subset H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a, b))$, there is an induced filtration $F^i W = F^i \cap W$. And the multiplication map $\mu_{W,c}$ respects the filtrations on W and on $H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a, b+c))$. If $\mu_{W,c}$ is surjective, then the associated graded pieces

$$\text{gr}^i \mu_{W,c} : \text{gr}^i W \otimes H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(0, c)) \rightarrow \text{gr}^i H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a, b+c)) \quad (166)$$

are all surjective. As the dimension of W is the sum of the dimensions of the pieces $\text{gr}^i W$, we should compute the minimum possible dimension of a vector subspace $W^i \subset \text{gr}^i H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a, b))$ such that $\text{gr}^i \mu_{W^i,c}$ is surjective (where $\text{gr}^i \mu_{W^i,c}$ is the obvious map).

Of course the associated graded parts for $\mathcal{O}(a', b')$ are just

$$\text{gr}^i H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a', b')) = \begin{cases} H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E(b' + i)), & 0 \leq i \leq a' \\ \{0\}, & i > a' \end{cases} \quad (167)$$

So we are looking for a subset $W^i \subset H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E(b+i))$ such that the multiplication map

$$\mathrm{gr}^i \mu_{W^i, c} : W^i \otimes H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E(c)) \rightarrow H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E(b+c+i)) \quad (168)$$

is surjective. Counting the dimensions of the spaces on the left and the right, we have

$$\dim(W^i)(c+1) \geq (b+c+i+1), \quad (169)$$

in other words,

$$\dim(W^i) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{b+i-1}{c+1} \right\rfloor + 2. \quad (170)$$

On the other hand, we can achieve this bound: simply take W^i to be generated by the set of monomials:

$$\{U^i V^{a-i} T_0^{(b+i)-j(c+1)} T_1^{j(c+1)} \mid j = 1, \dots, r\} \cup \{U^i V^{a-i} T_1^{b+i}\} \quad (171)$$

where $r = \left\lfloor \frac{b+i-1}{c+1} \right\rfloor$. Thus we have that the minimum necessary dimension for a c -generating linear series is

$$\dim(W) = 2a + 2 + \sum_{i=0}^a \left\lfloor \frac{b+i-1}{c+1} \right\rfloor. \quad (172)$$

If we write $b-1 = \beta_d(c+1) + \beta_r$ with $0 \leq \beta_r < c+1$ and if we write $a+b-1 = \alpha_d(c+1) + \alpha_r$ with $0 \leq \alpha_r < c+1$, then the sum above is just

$$2a + 2 + \sum_{i=0}^a \left\lfloor \frac{b+i-1}{c+1} \right\rfloor = \frac{1}{2(c+1)} (M(a, b, c) + E(a, b, c)) \quad (173)$$

where $M(a, b, c)$ and $E(a, b, c)$ are as above. $\square$

For the next result, we introduce the Cox homogeneous coordinate ring:

$$S = S(\mathbb{F}_1) := \mathbb{C}[T_0, T_1, U, V] = \bigoplus_{(a,b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2} H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a, b)). \quad (174)$$

This is a $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -graded ring, graded by $\deg(T_0) = \deg(T_1) = (0, 1)$, $\deg(V) = (1, 0)$ and $\deg(U) = (1, -1)$. For any multi-degree $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we have that $S_{(a,b)} = H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a, b))$. We put a graded lexicographical monomial order on S where the grading is by total degree ($\deg(a, b) = a + b$), and where $U > V > T_0 > T_1$.

In the proof of the lemma above, a special role was played by the linear system

$$W_0(a, b, c) = \mathrm{span} \left\{ U^i V^{a-i} T_0^{(b+i)-j(c+1)} T_1^{j(c+1)} \mid i = 0, \dots, a, j = 1, \dots, r(i) \right\} \quad (175)$$

$$+ \mathrm{span} \left\{ U^i V^{a-i} T_1^{b+i} \mid i = 0, \dots, a \right\}. \quad (176)$$

Here $r(i) = \left\lfloor \frac{b+i-1}{c+1} \right\rfloor$.

Lemma 7.3. *Suppose $W \subset H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a, b))$ is a linear system. If the vector space of initial terms $\mathrm{IN}(W)$ contains $W_0(a, b, c)$, then W is a c -generating linear system.*

Proof. Clearly we have that the vector space of initial terms of $\mathrm{image}(\mu_{W,c})$ satisfies

$$\mathrm{IN}(W) \cdot S_{(0,c)} \subset \mathrm{IN}(\mathrm{image}(\mu_{W,c})). \quad (177)$$

So if $\text{IN}(W)$ contains $W_0(a, b, c)$, then we have that

$$W_0(a, b, c) \cdot S_{(0,c)} \subset \text{IN}(\text{image}(\mu_{W,c})). \quad (178)$$

By construction, $W_0(a, b, c) \cdot S_{(0,c)} = S_{(a,b+c)}$. So we have $\text{IN}(\text{image}(\mu_{W,c})) = S_{(a,b+c)}$, and therefore $\text{image}(\mu_{W,c}) = S_{(a,b+c)}$. Therefore W is a c -generating linear system. $\square$

An important special case for us is when $a = d-1$, $b = (d-1)(k-1)$ and $c = k-3$ for some positive integers d and k (here d will be the degree of the hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, and k will be the degree of the curve $C_0 \subset X$). In particular, if $k \geq 2d-3$, then we have $b-1 = (d-1)(k-2) + d-2$ and $a+b-1 = (d-1)(k-2) + 2d-3$. So the formulas above reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} M(d-1, (d-1)(k-1), k-3) &= 2(k-2)(d-1)^2 + \\ &\quad 5(k-2)(d-1) + 4(k-2) + (3(d-1)^2 + 2(d-1) - 2), \\ E(d-1, (d-1)(k-2), k-3) &= (k-2)(d-1) - \\ &\quad (3(d-1)^2 + 2(d-1) - 2) \end{aligned} \quad (179)$$

So, if $k \geq 2d-3$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2(k-2)}(M+E) = (d-1)^2 + 3(d-1) + 2 = d^2 + d. \quad (180)$$

7.2. Cohomology Results. We introduce some incidence correspondences, analogous to those introduced in section 6. Let $N_d = \binom{n+d}{n} - 1$ and let $\mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ denote the projective space parametrizing hypersurfaces $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of degree d . Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^{N_d} \times \mathbb{P}^n$ denote the universal family of degree d hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{P}^n$. Let k be any integer with $1 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{2}$ (later we will only need the case that $k = 2d-3$). Let $\mathcal{R}^k(\mathbb{P}^n) \subset \text{Hilb}^{kt+1}(\mathbb{P}^n)$ denote the open subscheme parametrizing curves $C_0 \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ which are projectively equivalent to a degree k rational normal curve $C_0 \subset \mathbb{P}^k \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. Observe that $\mathcal{R}^k(\mathbb{P}^n)$ is a homogeneous space of PGL_{n+1} , and therefore is smooth and connected. Let $\mathcal{R}^k(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathbb{P}^{N_d} \times \mathcal{R}^k(\mathbb{P}^n)$ denote the parameter space for pairs $([X], [C_0])$ where $C_0 \subset X$. Observe that the projection $\mathcal{R}^k(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^k(\mathbb{P}^n)$ is a projective bundle of relative dimension $N_d - (kd+1)$.

Let $Q(t) = \frac{1}{2}(t+1)((2k-1)t+2)$ denote the Hilbert polynomial of a rational normal scroll of degree $2k-1$ in $\mathbb{P}^{2k}$. Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \text{Hilb}^{Q(t)}(\mathbb{P}^n)$ denote the open subscheme parametrizing subschemes $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ which are projectively equivalent to a rational normal scroll of degree $2k-1$ in $\mathbb{P}^{2k} \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ which is abstractly isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_1$. Let $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{R}^k(\mathbb{P}^n)$ denote the parameter space of pairs $([\Sigma], [C_0])$ where $C_0 \subset \Sigma$ and such that, using the isomorphism of Σ and $\mathbb{F}_1$, the line bundle of C_0 is $\mathcal{O}(1, 0)$. The projection map $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ factors as an open subset (with nonempty fibers) of a projective bundle over $\mathcal{U}$ of relative dimension 2 (actually each fiber is isomorphic to the $\mathbb{A}^2$ of irreducible curves in the linear system $|\mathcal{O}(1, 0)|$).

Let $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{P}^{N_d} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{R}^k(\mathbb{P}^n)$ denote the parameter space for triples $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$ where $([\Sigma], [C_0])$ is in $\mathcal{V}$ and where $\Sigma \subset X$. The projection map $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is a projective bundle of relative dimension $N_d - Q(d)$.

Now for a triple $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0]) \in \mathcal{W}$, we define $d_{X,\Sigma} : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(d-1))$ as in section 6. More precisely, let $\mathcal{E}$ be the trivial vector bundle on $\mathcal{W}$ of rank $n+1$, and let $\mathcal{G}$ be the vector on $\mathcal{U}$ whose fiber at a point Σ is just $H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(d-1))$, and

let $\mathcal{F}$ be the vector bundle on $\mathcal{W}$ which is $\mathrm{pr}_1^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{N_d}}(1)) \otimes \mathrm{pr}_2^*\mathcal{G}$. Then there is a map of vector bundles $d : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ whose fiber over $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$ is the map $d_{X,\Sigma}$ constructed above. Let $\mathcal{W}^o \subset \mathcal{W}$ be the open subscheme (possibly empty) parametrizing pairs $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$ such that the image of $d_{X,\Sigma}$ is a $(k-3)$ -generating linear series in $H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(d-3)|_\Sigma)$.

Lemma 7.4. *Let $f : \mathbb{F}_1 \rightarrow \Sigma$ be an isomorphism to a degree $2k-1$ rational normal scroll $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{P}^{2k} \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. For each pair of integers $a, b \geq 0$, consider the bundle*

$$N(a, b) = f^*(N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)) \otimes \mathcal{O}(a, b) \quad (181)$$

and the subbundle

$$N'(a, b) = f^*(N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^{2k}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(a, b). \quad (182)$$

Then we have the following:

1. $N'(0, 0)$ is generated by global sections and satisfies $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, N'(0, 0))$ is zero for $i > 0$,
2. $N(0, 0)$ is generated by global sections and satisfies $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, N(0, 0))$ is zero for $i > 0$,
3. if $\mathcal{F}$ is any coherent sheaf on $\mathbb{F}_1$ which is generated by global sections and satisfies $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{F})$ is zero for $i > 0$, then for every pair of nonnegative integers (a, b) we have that $\mathcal{F}(a, b) := \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}(a, b)$ is generated by global sections and satisfies $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{F}(a, b))$ is zero for $i > 0$.

In particular, we conclude that for any pair of nonnegative integers (a, b) , we have that $N(a, b)$ (resp. $N'(a, b)$) is generated by global sections and satisfies $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, N(a, b))$ is zero for $i > 0$ (resp. $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, N'(a, b))$ is zero for $i > 0$).

Proof. Recall that $\mathrm{pr}_1 : \mathbb{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is the projection morphism such that $\mathrm{pr}_1^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1}(f)$. Via pr_1 , $\mathbb{F}_1$ is isomorphic as a $\mathbb{P}^1$ -scheme to the total space of the projective bundle:

$$\mathbb{F}_1 \cong \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-k) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-(k-1))). \quad (183)$$

Under this isomorphism $\mathcal{O}(1, k-1)$ corresponds to the tautological quotient bundle $\mathcal{O}(1)$ on $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-k) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-(k-1)))$. In other words, up to projective equivalence, the map $f : \mathbb{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{2k}$ corresponds to the complete linear system of $\mathcal{O}(1)$, i.e. $f^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{2k}}(1) \cong \mathcal{O}(1)$. Using this identification, it is easy to see that we have a short exact sequence of vector bundles on $\mathbb{F}_1$:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathrm{pr}_1^*T_{\mathbb{P}^1} \rightarrow \mathrm{pr}_1^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)^{\oplus(2k-1)}) \otimes f^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{2k}}(1) \rightarrow f^*N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^{2k}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (184)$$

Twisting by $f^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{2k}}(-1)$, we observe that $N'(0, 0)$ is a quotient of $\mathrm{pr}_1^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)^{\oplus(2k-1)})$, and so is generated by global sections. Observe that we have the vanishing

$$(\mathrm{pr}_1)_*(\mathrm{pr}_1^*T_{\mathbb{P}^1} \otimes f^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{2k}}(-1)) = R^1(\mathrm{pr}_1)_*(\mathrm{pr}_1^*T_{\mathbb{P}^1} \otimes f^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{2k}}(-1)) = \{0\}. \quad (185)$$

Applying the long exact sequence of higher direct images to our short exact sequence (after twisting by $f^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{2k}}(-1)$), we have that $R^1(\mathrm{pr}_1)_*(f^*N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^{2k}}(-1))$ is zero, and $(\mathrm{pr}_1)_*(f^*N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^{2k}}(-1))$ is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)^{\oplus(2k-1)}$. From this and the Leray spectral sequence associated to $\mathrm{pr}_1 : \mathbb{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$, we conclude that $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, N'(0, 0))$ is zero for $i > 0$. This proves item (1) of the lemma.

Also observe that we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow N'(0, 0) \longrightarrow N(0, 0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(0, 0)^{\oplus(n-2k)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (186)$$

Since $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1})$ is zero for $i > 0$, we conclude that $N(0, 0)$ is generated by global sections and satisfies $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, N(0, 0))$ is zero for $i > 0$. This proves item (2) of the lemma.

Now suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is a coherent sheaf on $\mathbb{F}_1$ such that $\mathcal{F}$ is generated by global sections and such that $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{F})$ is zero for $i > 0$. We will prove by double induction on (a, b) that the same is true for $\mathcal{F}(a, b) := \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}(a, b)$.

First we prove the result when $b = 0$. We proceed by induction on a . If $a = 0$, the result is tautological. Thus suppose that $a > 0$ and suppose the result is proved for $a - 1$. Let $D \subset \mathbb{F}_1$ be a general member of the linear system $|\mathcal{O}(1, 0)|$. Then D is a smooth curve isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1$. Since D is general, we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(a - 1, 0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(a, 0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(a, 0)|_D \longrightarrow 0 \quad (187)$$

Now $\mathcal{F}|_D$ is generated by global sections. And $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1}(a(e + f))|_D$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(a)$. Thus we conclude that also $\mathcal{F}(a, 0)|_D$ is generated by global sections. By the induction assumption, $H^1(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{F}(a - 1, 0))$ is zero, we conclude by the long exact sequence of cohomology associated to the short exact sequence above, that all the global sections of $\mathcal{F}(a, 0)|_D$ lift to global sections of $\mathcal{F}(a, 0)$. Therefore $\mathcal{F}(a, 0)$ is generated by global sections. Also, a coherent sheaf on $\mathbb{P}^1$ which is generated by global sections has no higher cohomology. Combining this with the induction assumption and using the long exact sequence in cohomology associated to the short exact sequence above, we conclude that $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{F}(a, 0))$ is zero for $i > 0$. Therefore we conclude by induction that for all $a > 0$, $\mathcal{F}(a, 0)$ is generated by global sections and $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{F}(a, 0))$ is zero for $i > 0$.

Now we prove the result with b arbitrary. We proceed by induction on b . If $b = 0$, the result was proved in the last paragraph. Thus suppose that $b > 0$ and suppose the result is proved for $b - 1$. Let $L \subset \mathbb{F}_1$ be a general fiber of pr_1 . Then L is smooth and isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1$. Since L is general, we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(a, b - 1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(a, b) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(a, b)|_L \longrightarrow 0 \quad (188)$$

Now $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_1}(a(e + f) + bf)|_L$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(a)$. By a similar analysis to that in the last paragraph, we conclude that $\mathcal{F}(a, b)$ is generated by global sections and that $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{F}(a, b))$ is zero for $i > 0$. So item (3) is proved by induction on b . $\square$

Lemma 7.5. *Let $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0]) \in \mathcal{W}^o$ be any triple, and let $f : \mathbb{F}_1 \rightarrow \Sigma$ be some fixed isomorphism. Let $N'(a, b)$ and $N(a, b)$ be as in lemma 7.4. Also let us denote*

$$N_X(a, b)f^*(N_{\Sigma/X}(-1)) \otimes \mathcal{O}(a, b) \quad (189)$$

Then we have the following:

1. X is smooth along Σ
2. for each pair of nonnegative integers (a, b) , we have $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, N_X(a, b + k - 3))$ is zero for $i > 0$,

3. for any line of ruling $L \subset \Sigma$, $H^1(L, N_{L/X}(a-1))$ is zero for $a \geq 0$ any integer,
4. $H^1(C_0, N_{C_0/X}(a-2))$ is zero for $a \geq 0$ any integer,
5. the projection morphism $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ given by $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0]) \mapsto [X]$ is smooth at $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$,
6. for any line $L \subset \Sigma$, the projection morphism $F(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ given by $([X], [L]) \mapsto [X]$ is smooth at $([X], [L])$,
7. the projection morphism $\mathcal{R}^k(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ given by $([X], [C_0]) \mapsto [X]$ is smooth at $([X], [C_0])$, and
8. the projection morphism $\pi : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^k(\mathcal{X})$ given by $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0]) \mapsto ([X], [C_0])$ is smooth at $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$.

Proof. Since the partial derivatives of a defining equation of X give a c -generating linear series, in particular they generate the sheaf $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(d-1)$. Thus, there is no point of Σ at which all the partial derivatives vanish. By the Jacobian criterion, we conclude that X is smooth along Σ . This proves item (1).

For item 2, we observe that we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/X} \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/\mathbb{P}^n} \longrightarrow N_{X/\mathbb{P}^n}|_\Sigma \longrightarrow 0 \quad (190)$$

For ease of notation, define $\alpha = a + (d-1)$ and $\beta = b + (d-1)(k-1)$. We have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow N_X(a, b) \longrightarrow N(a, b) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\alpha, \beta) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (191)$$

When $a, b \geq 0$, it follows by lemma 7.4 that $H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, N(a, b))$ is zero for $i \geq 0$. By a simple calculation, we also see that

$$H^i(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(\alpha, \beta)) = \{0\}, i \geq 0. \quad (192)$$

So we conclude that $H^2(\mathbb{F}_1, N_X(a, b))$ is zero, and $H^1(\mathbb{F}_1, N_X(a, b))$ is zero iff the following map is surjective:

$$H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, N(a, b)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(\alpha, \beta)). \quad (193)$$

We have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, N(a, b)) \otimes H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a', b')) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, N(a+a', b+b')) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(\alpha, \beta)) \otimes H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a', b')) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(\alpha+a', \beta+b')) \end{array} \quad (194)$$

We conclude that if $H^1(\mathbb{F}_1, N_X(a, b))$ is zero and if $a', b' \geq 0$, then we also have that $H^1(\mathbb{F}_1, N_X(a+a', b+b'))$. So to prove item (2), we are reduced to the case $a=0, b=k-3$. But then the commutative diagram above factors as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, T_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \otimes H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(0, k-3)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, N(0, k-3)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(d-1, (d-1)(k-1))) \otimes H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(0, k-3)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(\alpha, \beta)) \end{array} \quad (195)$$

By definition, the composition

$$H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, T_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \otimes H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(0, k-3)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(\alpha, \beta)) \quad (196)$$

is surjective iff the triple $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$ is in $\mathcal{W}^o$. So if $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$ is in $\mathcal{W}^o$, then $H^1(\mathbb{F}_1, N_X(0, k-3))$ is zero. Thus item (2) holds.

For item (3), observe that we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow N_{L/\Sigma}(a-1) \longrightarrow N_{L/X}(a-1) \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/X}|_L(a-1) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (197)$$

Of course $N_{L/\Sigma} \cong \mathcal{O}_L$, thus $H^1(L, N_{L/\Sigma}(a-1))$ is zero for $a \geq 0$. So to prove item (3), it suffices to prove that $H^1(L, N_{\Sigma/X}|_L(a-1))$ is zero. Since $\mathcal{O}(a-1, b)|_L \cong \mathcal{O}_L(a-1)$, we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow N_X(a, k-3) \longrightarrow N_X(a, k-2) \longrightarrow N_{\Sigma/X}|_L(a-1) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (198)$$

By item (2), for $a \geq 0$ the higher cohomology of the first two terms vanishes. Thus by the long exact sequence in cohomology associated to this short exact sequence, we have that $H^1(L, N_{\Sigma/X}|_L(a-1))$ is zero for $a \geq 0$. This proves item (3).

Item (4) is almost identical to item (3) and is left as an exercise to the reader.

By [10, proposition 2.14.2], the obstruction space for the relative Hilbert scheme $\text{Hilb}^{Q(t)}(\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^{N_d})$ at a point $([X], [\Sigma])$ is contained in $H^1(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X})$. For a triple $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$ in $\mathcal{W}^o$, it follows from item (2) that

$$H^1(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X}) = H^1(\mathbb{F}_1, N_X(1, k-1)) \quad (199)$$

vanishes. It follows by [10, theorem 2.10] that $\text{Hilb}^{Q(t)}(\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^{N_d}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ is smooth at $([X], [\Sigma])$. Of course the projection $\mathcal{W}^o \rightarrow \text{Hilb}^{Q(t)}(\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^{N_d})$ is an open subset of a projective bundle, and so is smooth. Thus we conclude that the composite morphism $\mathcal{W}^o \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ is smooth. This proves item (5).

Item (6) is similar to item (5) and follows from item (3) which shows that $H^1(L, N_{L/X})$ is zero.

Item (7) is similar to item (5) and follows from item (4) which shows that $H^1(C_0, N_{C_0/X})$ is zero.

Since $\mathcal{W}^o \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ is smooth at $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$ and since $\mathcal{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ is smooth at $([X], [C_0])$, to prove that $\pi : \mathcal{W}^o \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^k(\mathcal{X})$ is smooth at $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$, it suffices to check that the derivative map $d\pi : T_{\mathcal{W}^o/\mathbb{P}^{N_d}} \rightarrow \pi^* T_{\mathcal{R}^k(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{P}^{N_d}}$ is surjective at $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$. This exactly reduces to the statement that $H^0(\Sigma, N_{\Sigma/X}) \rightarrow H^0(C_0, N_{\Sigma/X}|_{C_0})$ is surjective. Since the cokernel is contained in $H^1(\mathbb{F}_1, N_X(0, k-1))$, which is zero by item (3), we conclude the derivative $d\pi$ is surjective. Therefore $\pi : \mathcal{W}^o \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^k(\mathcal{X})$ is smooth. This proves item (8). $\square$

Now suppose that $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$ is a point in $\mathcal{W}^o$. Let $\sigma : C_0 \rightarrow \Sigma$ be the inclusion and let $\text{pr}_{C_0} : \Sigma \rightarrow C_0$ be the unique projection such that σ is a section of pr_L (in the model of Σ as $\mathbb{F}_1$, pr_{C_0} is simply pr_1). Let $g : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ be the inclusion.

Then we have an induced morphism $\zeta : C_0 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ given by the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma & \xrightarrow{g} & X \\ \downarrow \text{pr}_{C_0} & & \\ C_0 & & \end{array} \quad (200)$$

Lemma 7.6. *If $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$ is a triple in $\mathcal{W}^o$, then the corresponding morphism $\zeta : C_0 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$ is very twisting and very positive.*

Proof. First we check the axioms of definition 4.4. Since $g \circ \sigma : C_0 \rightarrow X$ is an embedding, in particular this map is stable, i.e. axiom (1) is satisfied. By item (7) of lemma 7.5, we conclude that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, k)$ is unobstructed at $[g \circ \sigma : C_0 \rightarrow X]$, i.e. axiom (2) is satisfied.

The argument that axiom (3) holds is exactly the same as the argument that axiom (3) holds in the proof of lemma 6.2, where item (6) of lemma 6.1 is replaced by item (3) of lemma 7.5.

As in the proof of lemma 6.2, we have that ζ^*T_{ev} is isomorphic to $(\text{pr}_{C_0})_* N_X(0, k-1)$. Of course ζ^*T_{ev} is ample iff $H^1(C_0, \zeta^*T_{\text{ev}}(-2))$ is zero. By the isomorphism above and a Leray spectral sequence argument analogous to the one in the proof of lemma 6.2, this cohomology group equals $H^1(\mathbb{F}_1, N_X(0, k-3))$. By item (2) of lemma 7.5, this group is zero. Therefore ζ^*T_{ev} is an ample bundle. So axiom (4) is satisfied.

Finally, observe that $\sigma^*\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ is $\mathcal{O}_{C_0}(1)$ and so is ample. So axiom (5) is satisfied. Thus ζ is a very twisting family.

Next we consider the axioms in definition 4.12. Axioms (1), (2) and (3) follow immediately from axioms (1), (2) and (3) of definition 4.3 proved above. To see that axiom (4) holds, observe that we have a short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \zeta^*T_{\text{ev}} \longrightarrow \zeta^*T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X,1)} \longrightarrow (g \circ \sigma)^*T_X \longrightarrow 0 \quad (201)$$

We have seen above that ζ^*T_{ev} is ample. Moreover, it follows by item (4) of lemma 7.5 that $N_{C_0/X}$ is an ample vector bundle. Since also T_{C_0} is an ample line bundle, we conclude that $T_X|_{C_0}$ is an ample vector bundle. Since the first and third terms in the short exact sequence above are ample, we conclude that $\zeta^*T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X,1)}$ is an ample vector bundle. Since $\zeta^*\text{pr}^*T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X,1)}$ is a quotient bundle of $\zeta^*T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X,1)}$, we also have that $\zeta^*\text{pr}^*T_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X,1)}$ is an ample vector bundle. So axiom (4) holds.

Finally, we have seen above that $\sigma^*\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ equals $\mathcal{O}_{C_0}(1)$, which is ample. Thus axiom (5) holds. So ζ is a very positive family. $\square$

Proposition 7.7. *If $n \geq d^2 + d + 2$ and if $d \geq 3$, for $k = 2d - 3$, we have that $\mathcal{W}^o \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^k(\mathcal{X})$ is dominant, and $\mathcal{R}^k(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ is dominant. So for $[X] \in \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ general, there exists a very twisting, very positive family $\zeta : C_0 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$.*

Proof. By item (8) of lemma 7.5, it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{W}^o$ is nonempty. We have to find a pair $([X], [\Sigma])$ such that for $a = d - 1$, $b = (d - 1)(k - 1)$ and for

$c = k - 3$, we have that the image of the derivative map

$$d_{X,\Sigma} : H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(a, b)) \quad (202)$$

is a c -generating linear system.

Recall that $S = \mathbb{C}[T_0, T_1, U, V]$ is the $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -graded Cox homogeneous coordinate ring of $\mathbb{F}_1$. Let A_d denote the set of monomials in the vector subspace $S_{(d-1, (d-1)(k-1))}$ which occur in the linear system $W_0(a, b, c)$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} A_d = & \left\{ U^i V^{d-1-i} T_0^{((d-1)(k-1)+i)-j(k-2)} T_1^{j(k-2)} \mid i = 0, \dots, d-1, j = 1, \dots, r(i) \right\} \\ & \cup \left\{ U^i V^{d-1-i} T_1^{(d-1)(k-1)+i} \mid i = 0, \dots, d-1 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (203)$$

where $r(i) = d-1 + \left\lfloor \frac{d-2+i}{k-2} \right\rfloor$. Let B_d denote the set of monomials of the form

$$\begin{aligned} B_d = & \left\{ U^{d-1} T_0^{(d-1)k-i(k-2)} T_1^{i(k-2)} \mid i = 0, \dots, d-2 \right\} \cup \\ & \left\{ U^{d-2} V T_0^{(d-1)k-1-i(k-2)} T_1^{i(k-2)} \mid i = 0, \dots, d-2 \right\} \cup \\ & \left\{ U^{d-3} V^2 T_0^{(d-1)k-2-(j+2)(k-2)} T_1^{(j+2)(k-2)} \mid j = 0, \dots, d-4 \right\} \cup \\ & \left\{ U^{d-4} V^3 T_0^{(d-1)k-3-(j+2)(k-2)} T_1^{(j+2)(k-2)} \mid j = 0, \dots, d-4 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (204)$$

Let C_d denote the set of monomials $C_d = A_d - B_d$. Now A_d contains $d^2 + d$ monomials, and B_d contains $4d - 8$ monomials. Choose homogeneous coordinates on $\mathbb{P}^n$ of the form

$$\{Y_0, \dots, Y_{2k}\} \cup \{X_M \mid M \in C_d\} \cup \{Z_l \mid l = 1, \dots, n - (d^2 + d + 2)\}. \quad (205)$$

Let $f : \mathbb{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{2k} \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be the map defined by sending a point $([T_0 : T_1], [T_0 U : T_1 U : V])$ to the point in $\mathbb{P}^n$ with coordinates $X_m = 0, m \in C_d$, with $Z_l = 0, l = 1, \dots, n - (d^2 + d)$, and with

$$Y_0 = T_0^k U, \dots, Y_i = T_0^{k-i} T_1^i U, \dots, Y_k = T_1^k U, \quad (206)$$

$$Y_{k+1} = T_0^{k-1} V, \dots, Y_{k+1+j} = T_0^{k-1-j} T_1^j V, \dots, Y_{2k} = T_1^{k-1} V. \quad (207)$$

This is an embedding whose image $\Sigma = f(\mathbb{F}_1)$ is a rational normal scroll of degree $2k - 1$.

Now the pullback map $H^0(\mathbb{P}^{2k}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{2k}}(1)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(1, k-1))$ is surjective by construction. And the natural map

$$\text{Sym}^{d-1} H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(1, k-1)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(d-1, (d-1)(k-1))) \quad (208)$$

is surjective. Therefore the pullback map

$$H^0(\mathbb{P}^{2k}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{2k}}(d-1)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathcal{O}(d-1, (d-1)(k-1))) \quad (209)$$

is surjective. For each monomial $M \in C_d$, choose a polynomial $G_M(Y_0, \dots, Y_{2k})$ such that $f^* G_M = M$.

Consider the hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ with defining equation

$$F = \sum_{i=0}^{d-2} (Y_i Y_{k+2+i} - Y_{i+1} Y_{k+1+i}) Y_0^{d-2-i} Y_{k-3}^i + \quad (210)$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{d-4} (Y_{d-1+j} Y_{k+d+1+j} - Y_{d+j} Y_{k+d+j}) Y_0^{d-4-j} Y_{k-3}^j Y_{2k-3} Y_{2k+1-d} + \quad (211)$$

$$\sum_{M \in C_d} G_M(Y_0, \dots, Y_{2k}) X_M. \quad (212)$$

The corresponding derivative map $d_{X,\Sigma}$ acts on the partial derivatives $\frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_i}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_0} &\mapsto U^{d-2} V T_0^{(d-1)k-2}; \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{i+1}} &\mapsto -U^{d-2} V T_0^{(d-1)k-1-i(k-2)} T_1^{i(k-2)} + \\ &\quad U^{d-2} V T_0^{(d-1)k-2-(i+1)(k-2)} T_1^{(i+1)(k-2)}, \\ &\quad i = 0, \dots, d-3, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{d-1}} &\mapsto -U^{d-2} V T_0^{(d-1)k-1-(d-2)(k-2)} T_1^{(d-2)(k-2)} + \\ &\quad U^{d-4} V^3 T_0^{(d-1)k-4-2(k-2)} T_1^{2(k-2)+1}, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{d+j}} &\mapsto -U^{d-4} V^3 T_0^{(d-1)k-3-(j+2)(k-2)} T_1^{(j+2)(k-2)} + \\ &\quad U^{d-4} V^3 T_0^{(d-1)k-4-(j+3)(k-2)} T_1^{(j+3)(k-2)}, \\ &\quad j = 0, \dots, d-5, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{k-1}} &\mapsto -U^{d-4} V^3 T_0^{(d-1)k-3-(d-2)(k-2)} T_1^{(d-2)(k-2)}, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_k} &\mapsto 0, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{k+1}} &\mapsto -U^{d-1} T_0^{(d-1)k-1} T_1, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{k+2+i}} &\mapsto U^{d-1} T_0^{(d-1)k-i(k-2)} T_1^{i(k-2)} - \\ &\quad U^{d-1} T_0^{(d-1)k-1-(i+1)(k-2)} T_1^{(i+1)(k-2)+1}, \\ &\quad i = 0, \dots, d-3, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{k+d}} &\mapsto U^{d-1} T_0^{(d-1)k-(d-2)(k-2)} T_1^{(d-2)(k-2)} - \\ &\quad U^{d-3} V^2 T_0^{(d-1)k-3-2(k-2)} T_1^{2(k-2)+1}, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{k+d+1+j}} &\mapsto U^{d-3} V^2 T_0^{(d-1)k-2-(j+2)(k-2)} T_1^{(j+2)(k-2)} - \\ &\quad U^{d-3} V^2 T_0^{(d-1)k-3-(j+3)(k-2)} T_1^{(j+3)(k-2)+1}, \\ &\quad j = 0, \dots, d-5, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{2k}} &\mapsto U^{d-3} V^2 T_0^{(d-1)k-2-(d-2)(k-2)} T_1^{(d-2)(k-2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (213)$$

In the list above, every partial derivative is a sum of at most two monomials, i.e. each partial derivative is a binomial, and the first term listed is the initial term with respect to our monomial order. From this list, it is clear that every monomial in B_d occurs as the initial term of some partial derivative. Also, for each $M \in C_d$, the partial derivative $\frac{\partial F}{\partial X_M}$ simply maps to M . Thus every monomial in C_d occurs as the initial term of some partial derivative. Thus every monomial in A_d occurs as the initial term of some partial derivative. So the vector space of initial terms of $\text{image}(d_{X,\Sigma})$ contains $W_0(a, b, c)$. Therefore, by lemma 7.3, we conclude that $\text{image}(d_{X,\Sigma})$ is a c -generating linear system. So, for any irreducible curve C_0 in the linear system of $|\mathcal{O}(1, 0)|$, we have that $([X], [\Sigma], [C_0])$ is in $\mathcal{W}^o$. $\square$

8. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section we prove theorem 1.1. As explained at the end of section 1, if $d < \frac{n+1}{2}$, then for a general hypersurface $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, hypothesis 1.2, hypothesis 1.3, and hypothesis 1.4 are satisfied. By proposition 6.3, if $d \geq 2$ and $d^2 \leq n+1$, then for $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ general we have that hypothesis 4.11 is satisfied. Finally, if $d \geq 3$ and if $d^2 + d + 2 \leq n$, then for $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ general there exists a very twisting, very positive family $\zeta : C_0 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, 1)$. Thus (ζ, ζ) is an inducing pair. Now by theorem 5.5, we conclude that for every $e \geq 1$ there exists an inducing pair $(\zeta_1, \overline{\zeta}_e)$. In particular, there exists a very positive 1-morphism $\overline{\zeta}_e : C \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, e)$. As seen in the proof of theorem 5.5, we may assume that C is smooth, i.e. C is equal to $\mathbb{P}^1$, and that the image of $\text{pr} \circ \overline{\zeta}_e : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is contained in the smooth part of the fine moduli locus. So, by item (2) of remark 4.13, we conclude that $\overline{\zeta}_e$ is a *very free* morphism. And by [7, proposition 7.4], we have that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is an irreducible variety. Therefore by [10, theorem IV.3.7], we conclude that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ is rationally connected.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Behrend. Gromov-Witten invariants in algebraic geometry. *Inventiones Mathematica*, 127:601–617, 1997. arXiv: math.AG/9601011.
- [2] K. Behrend and B. Fantechi. The intrinsic normal cone. *Inventiones Mathematica*, 128:45–88, 1998. arXiv: math.AG/961010.
- [3] K. Behrend and Y. Manin. Stacks of stable maps and Gromov-Witten invariants. *Duke Math Journal*, 85:1–60, 1996. arXiv: math.AG/9506023.
- [4] O. Debarre. *Higher-dimensional algebraic geometry*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, 2001.
- [5] W. Fulton. *Intersection Theory*, volume 2 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, 3. Folge*. Springer-Verlag, 2 edition, 1998.
- [6] A. Grothendieck. *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV*, volume 20, 24, 28, 32 of *Publications Mathématiques*. Institute des Hautes Études Scientifiques., 1964-1967.
- [7] J. Harris, M. Roth, and J. Starr. Rational curves on hypersurfaces of low degree. preprint arXiv: math.AG/0203088.
- [8] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry*, volume 52 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1977.
- [9] B. Kim and R. Pandharipande. The connectedness of the moduli space of maps to homogeneous spaces. In *Symplectic geometry and mirror symmetry*, chapter 5. World Scientific, 2001. arXiv: math.AG/0003168.
- [10] J. Kollár. *Rational Curves on Algebraic Varieties*, volume 32 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, 3. Folge*. Springer-Verlag, 1996.
- [11] R. Pandharipande. Intersections of $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisors on Kontsevich’s moduli space. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 351:1481–1505, 1999.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE MA 02138

E-mail address: harris@math.harvard.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE MA 02139

E-mail address: jstarr@math.mit.edu